

**DPI 312:
Sparking Social Change
Fall 2010**

Syllabus Revision: 10.12 (revised: Sept 14, 2010)

Archon Fung
124 Mt. Auburn St, Room 238
archon_fung@harvard.edu
Office Hours: Tuesdays 2:00-4:00pm

M/W 11:40pm – 1:00pm
L230

Mark Moore
124 Mt. Auburn St, Room 234
mark_moore@harvard.edu
Office Hours: Wednesdays 3:00-5:00pm

Faculty/Course Assistant:
Juanne Zhao, juanne_zhao@hks.harvard.edu

Course Assistant:
Pedro Henrique Fernandez, pedro_henrique_fernandes@hks11.harvard.edu

Course Objectives:

This course is an inductive examination of a large number of varied social change initiatives. Within the course we will look at the commitments, the resources, the calculations, and the techniques of social entrepreneurs who operate from very different positions with very different purposes. We do so to help students gain a broad understanding of the opportunities and strategies for making social change at small and large, local and systemic scales.

Central to our approach is the belief that significant social change can be made by individuals located in different social positions, standing on different institutional platforms, and using different kinds of human motivations and social processes to achieve important social goals.

- The different locations include individuals in disadvantaged social positions with little informal influence and no formal authority, and those in highly advantaged social positions who have significant authority over social assets and activities.
- The different institutional platforms include government, nonprofit and for profit enterprises.

- The different human motivations include material self-interest, altruism and a concern for the plight of others, and political commitments to particular image of a good and just society.
- And the different social processes include politics and political mobilization, social movements and social marketing, the passage and enforcement of laws, markets and economic production and consumption, voluntary association, community organization, and philanthropy.

While we often assume that effective social entrepreneurship has to be either political, or social or economic, our claim is that effective social entrepreneurship often involves finding the best way to use a particular position and platform, taking advantage of many different kinds of motivations and social processes to mobilize collective action and systemic change.

Obviously, the scope of the course is very broad, and includes many different topics. What makes the course distinctive from others, and gives it an internal coherence are two characteristics of the work of those we are describing as social entrepreneurs.

- First, the actors are always focused on the social impact of their work — the particular ways in which they think their work will create social or public value. It is this more than financial success, or the institutionalization of their efforts that commands their loyalty.
- Second, their basic method is to find the means to significantly leverage their own personal efforts, and that of the enterprises they lead, by aligning themselves with powerful social processes operating above the level of their particular position or organization, and through the development and use of collaborations and alliances.

Course Description

The course is organized into three parts.

The first part introduces the subject and the pedagogy of the course, and invites students to reflect on their own commitments to and capacity for social entrepreneurship. It will examine several individuals who have succeeded in catalyzing social changes from very different social and institutional positions. We will examine what it was about these individuals – what were their commitments, what were their personal resources, and what they did -- that made them successful where many others failed. Part of the aim of this portion of the course is to provide several models of social change agents for students to draw upon when reflecting on their own commitments and capacities, and crafting their own career trajectories. This part will conclude with a segment in which students take stock of their own commitments and capacities as social entrepreneurs, and try to develop a public narrative that is useful in guiding themselves, and engaging others in causes that matter to them.

The second part of the course develops and provides practice in using a simple strategic framework that can be helpful in spotting and exploiting value creating opportunities in the environ-

ment in which one is operating. The key idea of this concept is that one must develop a “public value proposition” – an idea about how the world could be improved by a particular line of action that is proposed by the social entrepreneur and innovator. To be sure that the idea is sustainable and doable, however, it is necessary to discipline the value proposition by testing it not only against political and philosophical conceptions of public value, but also the likelihood that the value proposition can command sufficient support to be sustainable over time, and that the proposed effort will, in fact, deliver the desired result. Methods for checking each of these concerns, and fitting the calculations together in a coherent whole will be provided.

The third part of the course takes on the challenge of finding ways to leverage the impact of a particular value proposition whose worth and sustainability in the world has been demonstrated at a small scale, but has not yet succeeded in producing a larger scale, systemic change. This is the most challenging and novel part of the course. It will focus on understanding the way that powerful social forces operate to prevent large changes to the status quo in the economy, in society, and in politics, and why it is that many good ideas are killed early, or, at best, find a small niche in which to operate. More importantly, however, it will also explore the processes that encourage change, and the strategies that can be used to take advantage of the dynamic parts of the economy, the society, and the political/governmental system.

Sparkling Social Change aims to foster an expertise in social change that consists of keen strategic sensibilities and an analogical ability to know what has worked elsewhere and how that can be adopted to one’s own circumstances.

Assignments and Course Evaluation

Students will be evaluated according to five tasks in the course.

1. Students are expected to be *prepared for every class and participate actively* in discussions.
2. At the end of the introduction to the course, each student will be asked to write 500-750 words reflecting on where he or she stands with respect to facing the personal challenges of social entrepreneurship. There is no right or wrong answer to this, and it will not be graded. The purpose is diagnostic for both the students and the professors – an occasion to see more clearly into the pre-occupations and concerns of each student.
3. Each student will be expected to *write and distribute a memo* of 500-750 words that analyzes the case and readings for one particular class session. The initial assignment will be made by the course instructors, but students will be allowed to request a change to a different class if there is a good reason to do so.
4. Each student will also be expected to participate as a member of a small group charged with the task of developing a plan for improving the overall performance of the K-12 Educational Sector as part of the final exercise in the course.
5. Finally, each student will be asked to write a *10-15 page strategic plan for initiating or dramatically expanding a particular effort to produce social change*. We will offer several different cases that students could choose to analyze. If there are students currently engaged with a social change effort that they would like to use as the focus of their analy-

sis, they may do so with the permission of the instructors. Such students should submit in writing a request to exercise this option, and providing sufficient background materials on the effort they would like to analyze that the Professors can make an informed choice about whether the analysis can serve the educational purposes of the course.

Required Materials

Required materials will be provided in course packets to be purchased at the Course Materials Office.

I. Social Catalysts: The Will and Capacity to Act for Social Purposes in Social Contexts

Monday, Aug 30, 2010: SHOPPING DAY

Brief introduction to Sparking Social Change, with time for questions.

Wednesday, September 1

1: Social Entrepreneurship: Muhammad Yunus and the Grameen Bank: The Origins

Case: “Muhammad Yunus and the Grameen Bank (A)” KSG Case No. 1881.0
“Muhammad Yunus and the Grameen Bank (B)” KSG Case No. 1882.0

Case Questions:

- 1) Has Muhammad Yunus discovered an important opportunity for social entrepreneurship? What is the nature of that opportunity? How large is it? What is necessary to exploit it? How could it go wrong?
- 2) What, if anything about the opportunity Yunus sees makes it an opportunity for “social” as opposed to “commercial” entrepreneurship?
- 3) What does Yunus bring to this opportunity that others have not had?
- 4) Should Yunus accept the challenge of opening a branch office in Tangail? What the risks and benefits of doing so?
- 5) Should he modify the Grameen model to work better in the difficult circumstances of Tangail, or is the basic model sufficiently robust?

Readings:

William Drayton, Everyone a Changemaker; Social Entrepreneurship’s Ultimate Goal, Innovatinos, Vol. 1, Issue 1 Winter, 2006

William Drayton, The Citizen Sector: Becoming as Entrepreneurial and Competitive as Business, California Management Review Reprint Series CMR vol . 44, number 3, Spring 2002

Moore, “On The Social Structure and Dynamics of Public Leadership”

Reading Questions:

- 1) What do you think you bring to society's efforts to identify and solve problems, or find and exploit significant opportunities for improvement? What assets can you personally call on to improve the quality of individual and social life?
- 2) What is the most significant thing you have done so far to make a significant social change? How did it start? What did you see that others had missed? What allowed you to exploit the opportunity?
- 3) How would you define social entrepreneurship? What, if anything, makes it different from community organizing, political advocacy, or public leadership? What seems similar to you among these different concepts?
- 4) What "institutional platforms" seem to fit you best? For-profit organizations? Political organizations? Community self-help organizations? Government agencies? What is it about those platforms that suit you better than others? What do you think gives these platforms leverage in trying to produce social change?

Monday, September 6 — NO CLASS — Labor Day

Wednesday, September 8, 2010

2. Government Innovators: Jean Ekins and the Family Learning Center

Case: "Jean Ekins and the Family Learning Center (A)", KSG Case No. 870.0

Case Questions:

- 1) Is Jean Ekins a "public innovator"? What is it about what she does that makes it reasonable to describe her as such? How important do you think her work is? Is it something you would be proud to have done?
- 2) What motivations and purposes seem to animate and guide her action? What kind of person is she trying to be? What values seem to guide her innovative efforts?
- 3) What personal assets does she bring to her work in general, and more particularly for creating the Family Learning Center in Leslie, Michigan? What liabilities does she have?
- 4) What are the key opportunities she spots, and the key actions she takes that breathe life into the Family Learning Center?

- 5) At the end of the case, Jean Ekins and the Family Learning Center seem threatened. What is the size and character of the threat? What do you think will happen if Jean Ekins does nothing? What can she do to preserve her program? What should she do?

Readings:

Charles Leadbetter and Sue Goss, Civic Entrepreneurship, Introduction, pp. 9-18 (London, Demos, 1998)

Alan Altshuler and Robert Behn eds, Innovation in American Government: Challenges, Opportunities, and Dilemmas, Chapters 1 and 13

Reading Questions:

- 1) How much room is there for innovation in government? Is entrepreneurship possible? What are the principal constraints to innovation in government? What opportunities does government afford?
- 2) What criteria would you use to decide whether a particular government innovation was significant or not?
- 3) What role can government play in replicating or scaling up important social innovations? Can you think of some examples when government has done this?

Monday, September 13

3. Community Organizing: The Orange Hats of Fairlawn

Case: The Orange Hats of Fairlawn: A Washington, D.C. Neighborhood Battles Drugs (HKS Case #C16-91-1034.0)

Case Questions:

- 1) Can neighborhoods count on having people like Edward Johnson? How special is he?
- 2) Was Johnson right when he “blamed himself and his neighbors” rather than the police for the problems of Fairlawn? (case, page 5).
- 3) How did Johnson move his neighbors from inaction to action?
- 4) What were their strategic choices with respect to the extent and timing of “help” from outsiders such as the police?

Readings:

Robert Putnam, Chapter 18 “Safe and Productive Neighborhoods” in *Bowling Alone: The Decline and Rise of American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001): 307-318.

Michael Taylor, Chapter 1 “Introduction: The Problem of Collective Action” in *The Possibility of Cooperation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987): 1-30.

Reading Questions:

- 1) Does Fairlawn have a lot of social capital or only a little?
- 2) What kind of collective action problem does Fairlawn have, in Michael Taylor’s terms?
- 3) Taylor discusses political entrepreneurship as a solution to the collective action problem. If we think of Johnson as a political entrepreneur in Taylor’s sense, what does Johnson do to solve the collective action problem in Fairlawn?

Further Reading [not provided]:

Jane Jacobs. Chapter 2 “The Uses of Sidewalks: Safety” in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York: Modern Library, 1993 [1961]): 37-71.

Wednesday, September 15

4. Shifting Platforms: Aruna Roy, Village Corruption, and the Right to Information

Case: Aruna Roy and the Birth of a People’s Movement in India (Draft May 28, 2009) case by Kenneth Winston

Case Questions:

- 1) What considerations led Roy to leave the prestigious and powerful IAS?
- 2) What does she lose as a social change agent in moving from the organizational “platform” of the IAS to work in civil society organizations? What does she gain? Is this a good choice for her, for anyone?
- 3) How important is Roy’s vow of poverty and commitment to “living simply?” Why is this choice important or unimportant?

- 4) Should most people in Aruna Roy's position do what she did — leave the IAS — in order to make the greatest social change? Why or why not?

Readings:

Jenkins, Rob and Anne Marie Goetz. "Accounts and Accountability: Theoretical Implications of the Right-to-Information Movement in India." *Third World Quarterly* 20.3 (1999): 603-22.

Reading Questions:

- 1) What is the goal of the MKSS? How does information relate to social justice in their view?
- 2) What is their method for making information available to villagers? What obstacles face information campaigns?
- 3) How does information contribute to social action in the MKSS model? What are the other factors, other than just information, that produce social action?

Monday, September 20

5. Public Narrative 1: Reflecting on Myself as a Social Entrepreneur:

Readings:

Marshall Ganz, *Leading Change: Leadership, Organization, and Social Movements*

Ganz, Marshall, "Public Narrative Worksheet: Self, Us and Now [Fall 2009]"

Wednesday, Sept 22

6. Public Narrative 2: Creating a Story of Me, Us, and Now

II. Techniques for Sparking Change: Spotting Opportunities/Developing Plans to Exploit

Monday, Sept. 27

7. The Strategic Triangle: A Framework for Spotting and Exploiting Opportunities

Case: The Librarian

Case Questions:

- 1) What do you think the Librarian did do? What do you think the librarian should do?
- 2) Suppose the library was not a governmental organization, but a non-profit organization. Would that change your view about what the librarian could or should do? In what ways?
- 3) Suppose the library was a for-profit commercial enterprise. Would that change your view about what the librarian could or should do?
- 4) What assumptions are you making about the motivations of the librarian, the valuable ends and purposes of the library, and the different structures of accountability that the librarian faces in these different institutional locations?
- 5) Is social entrepreneurship tied to a particular institutional position, or is it more closely related to a particular mindset? What are the key features of that mindset? What disciplines the value creating imagination of a social entrepreneur?

Readings:

M. H. Moore, *Managing for Value: Organizational Strategy in For-Profit, Non-Profit and Governmental Organizations*

M. H. Moore, *On Creating Public Value: What Business (And Non-Profit Organizations) Might Learn from Government about Strategic Management* (September 2003)

Reading Questions:

1. What is the concept of public value? What makes it different from private value, or is it simply the sum of private valuations?
- 2) How could one tell if one was producing public value as a social entrepreneur? Where do the individual valuations of those who benefit from the entrepreneurial effort fit into this scheme? Where do revenue streams earned by the sale of products and services, or

those made by voluntary donors, or those made by government agencies fit into judgments as to whether public value is being created or not?

3) How could one measure the production of public value in non-financial terms? Would it be useful to do so? How easy would it be to convert publicly or socially valued results into either financial measures, or revenue streams?

4) Why do strategy models in the private sector not include the “legitimacy and support” circle of the strategic calculation? Is legitimacy and support not crucial to their success? Where does it come from?

Wednesday, September 29

8. Developing and Testing Value Propositions (I): Defining, Measuring, and Paying for Public Value

Case: LISC: Issues in Assessing the Impact of Social Investment (Kennedy School of Government Case # 1370.0)

Case Questions:

- 1) What social or public value is LISC trying to create?
- 2) What is the logic model, or idea about a value chain, that they are relying on to create that value?
- 3) How could one measure the degree to which LISC has been successful in creating that social or public value?
- 4) How important is it for LISC to be able to demonstrate objectively that any improvements in social conditions can be attributed to its operations? What burden does that place on the development of measurement systems?
- 5) What is LISC’s “distinctive competence” that makes it different from ordinary banks? How valuable is that to society? Who will pay for it?

Readings:

Kaplan, "Balanced Scorecard For Public-Sector Organizations", HBS Case No B9911C.

Moore, The “Public Value Scorecard:” A Rejoinder and an Alternative to “Strategic Performance Measurement and Management in Non Profit Organizations” by Robert Kaplan [March, 2004], (Cambridge: © 2004), pp. 1-19.

Moore, Recognizing Public Value: "The Challenge of Defining and Recognizing Public Value", Chapter 1 pp. 1-61

Reading Questions:

- 1) Why can't financial systems perform the same vital role in assessing the value creating performance of government and non-profit organizations that they can in the private sector?
- 2) What would private sector managers have to do to assess the value creating performance of the organizations they led if they could not have information about the revenues they earned through the sale of the goods and services they produced?
- 3) One way to think about the problem of "recognizing social or public value" is that it is merely a technical problem. All we have to do is find some way to impute value to effects that occur in society, and matter to individuals living in the society, but do not necessarily pass through markets where their value can be registered in explicit exchanges. The most common idea is that we should find some way of determining an individual's willingness to pay even when we can't observe them taking this action. The alternative idea is that the problem is not just that we can't see individuals valuing goods and services in markets, but that individuals are not necessarily the right "arbiter" of social or public value; the right arbiter of social or public value should be a collective, or at least an individual acting on an individually held view of what would be good for the collective, rather than individuals deciding what they want for themselves. Which seems more accurate to you?
- 5) How big a problem is created for social entrepreneurs working in government, in nonprofits and for profit enterprises if it proves difficult to measure the public value they are creating through their efforts, to monetize the value of that result, or to tie the value created to a particular revenue stream?

Monday, Oct. 4

9. Developing and Testing Value Propositions (II): Developing the Ideal

Case: The Harlem Children's Zone: Driving Performance with Measurement and Evaluation", (HBS Case No 303-109)

Case Questions:

- 1) What is the key value proposition that is now guiding the actions of Harlem Children's zone? How plausible do you think it is? What evidence do we have that the value proposition is correct? Is it an argument based on fact, on logic, or on ideology?
- 2) Do you think the value proposition being advanced and tested by the Harlem Children's Zone is a scalable idea? How can the enterprise grow? What will be the principal constraints to scaling up?

- 3) Is the Harlem Children's Zone more or less highly leveraged than the Campaign to End Teen Pregnancy?

Readings:

Susan Colby, Nan Stone, Paul Carttar, "Zeroing in on Impact" Stanford Social Innovation, Fall, 2004

Eugene Bardach, A practical Guide for Policy Analysis: The Eightfold Path to More Effective Problem Solving (Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press © 2005) pp. 1-34

Mark H. Moore, What Sorts of Ideas Become Public Ideas in Robert Reich, ed. The Power of Public Ideas (Cambridge, Mass. Ballinger Press, 1988) pp. 55-85

Questions for the Readings:

- 1) A "market opportunity" in the private sector consists of a group of individuals with desires and needs that could be satisfied by a product or service offered by a producing firm at a price that those potential customers would be both able and willing to pay. How would one describe the nature of the "social opportunity" that is the distinctive focus of a social entrepreneur? To what extent is that opportunity defined by the desires and needs of a particular group of individuals considered particularly needy and deserving? To what extent is that opportunity defined by some concept of a social problem that needs to be ameliorated? How do some social conditions get identified as social problems that should be addressed even if the individuals benefited from the solution cannot pay for the solution? How do some individuals get identified as being needy or deserving of help from third parties of one kind or another?
- 2) What is the relationship between the techniques of policy analysis and design as outlined by Bardach, and the techniques that social catalysts could use to assess the social significance of finding a method of dealing with some important social problem? Is the underlying logic similar or different?
- 3) Moore argues that only certain kinds of ideas become powerful ideas. To what extent do you think the idea of "reducing teen pregnancy" has the qualities that could make it a powerful social idea? Consider some alternative ways of defining the problem to which Sawhill and her colleagues seek to solve. Are there some ideas that are potentially more powerful?

Wednesday, October 6

10. Developing and Testing Value Propositions (III): Organizing for Economic and Social Advantage

Case: “Other Peoples' Garbage: Brazil's Waste Pickers Struggle for Income, Respect, and Solidarity” by Andrea Tissenbaum [Draft - August 2009] pp. 1-18.]

[Video segment to be shown at beginning of class]

Case Questions:

- 1) What is the value proposition of Waste Pickers' Cooperatives?
- 2) Waste pickers pursue a variety of value: income, social status, self-government. Are there trade offs between these values?
- 3) There are complicated relationships between different kinds of organizations in this case: small cooperatives, networks of cooperatives, the local state, national state. Draw a figure depicting, as best you can, the relationship between the different organizational actors in this case.
- 4) What is the “public value” that is captured by the organization of the waste pickers and the creation of a public policy that benefits those organizations?
- 5) The democratic self-management of cooperatives seems to be important to the waste pickers. Is the cooperative structure, as opposed to a more conventional hierarchical form of organization, a help or obstacle to the goals of the waste pickers?
- 6) What is, and what should be, the relationship between city authorities — such as those charged with maintaining streets and sanitation — be to the waste pickers?

Readings:

Offe, Claus, and Helmut Wiesenhal. “Two Logics of Collective Action” in *Political Power and Social Theory* 1 (1980): 67-115.

Reading Questions:

- 1) Earlier in this class, we have encountered the problem of collective action and the role of the political entrepreneur in solving collective action problems. Constructions such as the “prisoners dilemma” and “assurance games” are highly abstract. What, if anything, does the more “sociological” approach to collective action of Offe and Wiesenhal add to these abstractions.

- 2) The central claim of Offe and Wieselthaler is that individuals with different social positions (workers, capitalists) face fundamentally different kinds of collective action problems. Why do they think it is far more difficult for workers to act collectively than for capitalists? Are they right?
- 3) Offe and Wieselthaler argue that workers must agree on what interests they hope to advance through organization — they must alter their very identities — and that this makes their collective action quite difficult. Did the waste pickers have to reach such agreements and reinvent themselves in order to organize? How difficult was this?

Monday, October 11: NO CLASS — Columbus Day

III. Techniques for Creating Social Change: Pathways to Scale, Sustainability and Systemic Change

Wednesday, October 13

11. Introduction to the Idea of Systemic and Social Change

Readings:

Wilson, J.Q. *Political Organizations: Chapters 2, 3, 4*

Mansbridge, *Beyond Self Interest: Chapters 2, 8*

Moore, *Social Entrepreneurship, Mass Mobilization, and Systems Change* (March, 2005)

Moore, *Social Problem-Solving, Social Innovation, and Social Change* (January, 2010)

Reading Questions

- 1) One might say that the fundamental source of all social change is human desire and energy. That is the thing that is at least necessary, if not sufficient, for an individual to be able to mobilize collective action, and make social change. What kinds of things motivate human beings to act in the short run, and even more important, to make commitments to action over the long run? What part of the motivation is selfish, what part altruistic, what part dutiful, what part driven by a vision of a good and just society? What part focused on material well being and physical security, and what part focused on the quality of relationships one can enjoy and use in valuable work? What can social entrepreneurs do to tap into these sources of energy?
- 2) One can also observe that any given moment, resources for action have been committed to particular institutions, guided by particular commitments, and held in place by certain kinds of accountability. Fortunately, there is often some slack in the overall system – some resources that are free, or latent, or can be shifted from one purpose to another. It is from those well-springs that the potential for social change must be developed and exploited. How can such pockets of opportunity be spotted, further developed, and used?
- 3) What kinds of social goals and values can connect with individuals with energy and motivation, who have capacities for social action? What does a social entrepreneur have to do connect visions of future possibilities to concrete, collective action in the present.
- 4) Individuals gain some leverage over the conditions in which they and their fellows live by making good use of the particular social and institutional positions they occupy. They can be good neighbors and citizens. They can be good managers, and leaders in the specific social and institutional positions they occupy. But they might also gain leverage by finding the means that extend their influence from particular positions to a much wider effect. They can use techniques of political mobilization and social marketing to extend their impact beyond the boundaries of the organizations they lead by generating a demand or a capacity for change. They can use the power of established law, or the process of changing existing laws, to transform social conditions at scale. They can use market forces to increase the scale of the organization they lead, and with that, change the character of an industry in which they are operating – whether that be mining or health or education. They can use professional networks to cause a good idea to leap from one organization to another as particular ideas of good practice take hold in a professional network. And so on. What is a useful way to think about how to take advantage of these different opportunities for leveraged influence? Does one's social or institutional position limit the kinds of processes one can use? Are politicians restricted to politics, lawyers to legal change, businessmen to the use of markets, and professionals limited to the use of professional norms? Or, can individuals standing different platforms use many different combinations of these processes? How can one figure out which of these to use, in what combination, in what way?

Monday, October 18

12. Using Politics and Political Forces to Make Social Change (I):

Case: Kmart Union in Greensboro Fights for a Contract (A) and (B) HKS Case #C15-00-1603.0 and #C15-00-1604.0

Case Questions:

- 1) ACTWU and the Pulpit Forum are organizations that in different ways claim to advance the interests of workers at the Kmart distribution center in Greensboro. In what ways do these two organizations represent well and fail to represent the interests of workers?
- 2) Is unionization a good thing for workers in Greensboro? For Greensboro overall?
- 3) Was the disruption of the Greater Greensboro Open golf event (in the (A) case) strategically wise? What would have made this action more effective?
- 4) What was the effect of the Pastor's civil disobedience (in the (B) case) on the Kmart negotiations? Who are the different actors that figure, both in the foreground and background, of this negotiation and the drama around it?

Readings:

Richard Freeman and James Medoff. Chapter 1 "A New Portrait of U.S. Unionism" and Chapter 15 "The Slow Strangulation of Private Sector Unions" in *What Do Unions Do?* (New York: Basic Books, 1984): 3-25.

Reading Questions:

- 1) What are the two faces — monopoly and collective voice — faces of unionism?
- 2) Evaluate the arguments that unions help or hurt (i) efficiency and (ii) the distribution of income. What do you believe?
- 3) What are the competing explanations for the decline of private sector union density in chapter 15? What do you think killed U.S. unionism?

Further Reading [not provided]:

Marshal Ganz. "Why David Sometimes Wins: Strategic Capacity in Social Movements" in David M. Messick, Roderick Moreland Kramer eds., *The Psychology of Leadership: New Perspectives and Research* (Lawrence Erlbaum Press, 2004): 215-250.

Voss, Kim, and R Sherman. "Breaking the Iron Law of Oligarchy: Union Revitalization in the American Labor Movement 1." *American Journal of Sociology* 106.2 (2000): 303-49.

Wednesday, October 20

13. Using Politics and Political Forces to Make Social Change (II): State, Society, and Social Change: Kerala, India

Case:

Patrick Heller and T.M. Thomas Isaac, "The Peoples' Campaign for Democratic Decentralization" in Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright eds, *Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance* (London: Verso Press, 200x): 77-110.

Case Questions:

- 1) What are the aims of the architects of the People's Campaign? What kind of social change would they like to see?
- 2) What is the public value that they seek?
- 3) What resources and capabilities can they draw upon?
- 4) What are the important institutional design elements of the People's Campaign for Democratic Decentralization?
- 5) T.M. Thomas Isaac had a "big bang" theory of design. Instead of making sure that there was local democratic capacity before devolving control of resources, he thought that resources should be devolved first, and then capacity will come. What do you think of the big bang proposition?
- 6) Is this kind of local participatory planning a good strategy for development? Why or why not?
- 7) Is this kind of local participatory planning good for equality and social inclusion [for women, for low status individuals in scheduled castes/tribes]? Why or why not?

Readings:

Heller, Patrick, KN Harilal, and Shubum Chaudhuri. "Building Local Democracy: Evaluating the Impact of Decentralization in Kerala, India." *World Development* 35.4 (2007): 626-48.

James Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition have Failed* (Yale, 1998): Chapters 1 and 9

Reading Questions:

- 1) Do you accept the evidence that the Peoples' Campaign has created large and valuable social change?
- 2) More participatory forms of decision-making are often thought to be less efficient and effective. What are the arguments for the decentralization strategy of the Peoples' Campaign being more effective than top-down forms of decision-making? Do you accept these reasons or reject them?
- 3) What is James Scott's notion of metis? He observes that many state directed efforts at social change destroy metis and have disastrous consequences. Does the state-directed Peoples' Campaign fall into this trap, or avoid it? Why?

Monday, October 25

14. Using Politics and Political Forces to Make Social Change (III):

Case: GoodGuide (<http://www.goodguide.com/>)

Readings:

Daniel Goldman. "Full Disclosure" in *Ecological Intelligence: How Knowing the Hidden Impacts of What We Buy Can Change Everything* (New York: Broadway Books, 2009): 83-100.

Case Questions:

- 1) Go to GoodGuide.com [disclosure: Archon Fung is on GoodGuide's Board] and look up a product that you regularly use. Can you envision this tool, or one like it, altering your purchasing decisions? Why or why not?
- 2) What is GoodGuide's public value proposition? Do you think this proposition is correct? What are the most likely ways that it is incorrect?
- 3) GoodGuide is incorporated as a for-profit corporation. It is financed principally through venture capital. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the for-profit platform for this enterprise, as opposed to a non-profit platform?
- 4) What are the largest barriers to GoodGuide becoming successful?

Reading:

Archon Fung, Mary Graham, and David Weil. Chapter 4, “What Makes Transparency Work” in *Full Disclosure: The Perils and Promise of Transparency* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 50-105.

Reading Questions:

- 1) What does it mean for a transparency policy or system to be “effective.”
- 2) Think of various information policies and systems that you encounter in your own life. Which ones change your behavior and which ones do not? Do any of them actually make you behave in ways that are bad for you or bad for society?
- 3) What is the “action cycle” of transparency?
- 4) Do you think that GoodGuide’s information efforts will be effective, in light of the “action cycle” analysis?

Wednesday October 27

15. Using Politics and Political Forces to Make Social Change (IV) Building Cross-Sector Collaborations

Case: Broadmoor Lives! A New Orleans Neighborhood’s Battle to Recover from Hurricane Katrina (A, B, Sequel) HKS Case #1893.0, 1894.0, 1894.1

[Broadmoor Lives! slideshow to be shown in class]

Case Questions:

- 1) Before Hurricane Katrina, was the Broadmoor neighborhood a place of high or low social capital? Was it well organized or not?
- 2) What are the different factions of neighbors in the Broadmoor neighborhood? What are their “natural” conflicts of interest?
- 3) Who were the leaders of the Broadmoor neighborhood? What capacities and resources did each bring to the effort?
- 4) What are the important steps in the processes that leaders designed to bring residents back to the neighborhood and to involve them in rebuilding efforts?

- 5) The Broadmoor Improvement Association formed many partnerships with organizations outside the neighborhood that brought critical resources of various kinds. Who were these partners? What made the BIA attractive as a partner for these outside entities?

Reading:

Xavier de Souza Briggs. Introduction [selections] and Chapter 2, “Democracy and Public Problems” of *Democracy as Problem Solving: Civic Capacity in Communities Across the Globe* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008): 3-17; 27-45.

Reading Questions:

- 1) What, if any, is the difference between civic capacity and social capital?
- 2) What distinguishes Briggs’ problem-solving notion of democracy compared to what he calls pluralist and deliberative notions of democracy?
- 3) What are the reasons to think that democratic [participatory, inclusive, accountable] public action will be effective? Do you accept any of these reasons?

Monday, November 1

16. Using the Law to Secure Social Change: Substantive and Procedural Rights

Cases: Roe v. Wade 410 US 113 (1973)
 Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission 558 US 50 (2010)
 [*note: The text of the Supreme Court opinions is not assigned as reading*]

Was Roe v. Wade a Good Thing for Pro-Choice?

Readings:

Gerald Rosenberg. “Introduction” and Chapter 6 “Transforming Women’s Lives? The Courts and Abortion” in *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991): 1-8; 175-201.

Archon Fung. “Making Rights Real: Roe’s Impact on Abortion Access.” *Politics and Society* 21.4 (1993): 465-504.

New York Times blog debate: “How Corporate Money Will Reshape Politics” (January 21, 2010), URL: <http://roomfordebate.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/01/21/how-corporate-money-will-reshape-politics/>

Reading Questions:

- 1) What are the reasons to think that abortion access would have been widely available in the 1970s and 1980s *even if* the Court had not rendered an affirmative decision for a woman's right to choose in *Roe v. Wade*?
- 2) In his article, Mark Tushnet offers three arguments against social change through legal/constitutional rights. One of these is that legalization of reform is political debilitating. What is this argument? Is he right in the case of *Roe*? Why or why not?
- 3) Gerald Rosenberg argues that the Court is less attractive than many think as a vehicle for social change. Why does he think this? Do you agree?
- 4) Will last year's Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United v. FEC* result in substantial and lasting social change? If so, what's wrong with Rosenberg's and Tushnet's arguments?

Wednesday, November 3**17. Using the Law to Make Social Change (2):**

Case: The Workplace Project

Jennifer Gordon, "The Workplace Project Story" Chapter 2 of *Suburban Sweatshop: The Fight For Immigrant Rights* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005): 67-111.

Case Questions

- 1) What resources & capacities does Jennifer Gordon possess as a social change agent?
- 2) What is the value proposition that led her to found the Workplace Project?
- 3) What research and fact finding did she conduct in order to formulate this value proposition?
- 4) On p. 73, she writes that the conventional legal value propositions — legal services and impact litigation, were not appropriate. What are those propositions?
- 5) Who are the members of the Workplace Project?
- 6) Jane Addams said (Fine, p. 95) that the aim of Settlement Houses was to create citizens and not to manage clients. What does this mean in the context of the Workplace Project?

Readings:

Selections from Janice Fine. *Worker Centers: Organizing Communities at the Edge of the Dream* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

Chapter 1. Origins and Characteristics of Workers Centers, pp. 7-26

Chapter 4. Delivering Services on the Front Lines, pp. 72-91, 94-99

Chapter 7. Public Policy Enforcement and Reform, pp. 157-171

Reading Questions:

- 1) Who do Worker Centers serve?
- 2) Is their growth pattern a lot or a little?
- 3) What are the key differences between a union based strategy and the strategies of worker centers?
- 4) What are the important kinds of legal services for those who go to Worker Centers?
- 5) What does Fine mean when she writes of the tension between providing services and organizing to empower people? How should Worker Centers address this tension?
- 6) What laws are important for Worker Centers?
- 7) What is the relationship between government and Workers Centers in implementing these laws? In making them?

Monday, Nov. 8

18. Using Markets and Market Forces to Make Social Change (I):

Case: Unilever in India: Hindustan Lever's Project Shakti—Marketing FMCG to the Rural Consumer (HBS Case 9-505-056)

Case Questions:

- 1) What are the key features of Shakti? What are its positive aspects and what are its drawbacks?

- 2) What was the motivation for the Shakti initiative? Was it a Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative, or part of a profit-oriented business plan? What difference does this make in your evaluation of the initiative?
- 3) How can Shakti contribute to HLL's bottom line? Can you make a business case for the effort?
- 4) What is the private, economic value created by Shakti? What is the social, public value?
- 5) What key challenges do Shakti's managers face? What should they do?
- 6) If Shakti cannot become profitable, should HLL continue the program? If so, why, and how can it do so while meeting its fiduciary responsibilities to shareholders?

Readings:

Schumpeter, Joseph A., *The Theory of Economic Development*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1961. Pp.74-94

Drucker, Peter F., *Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Practices and Principles*, Harper & Row Publishers: New York, 1985. Introduction and Chapter 1.

Stevenson, Howard H., "A Perspective on Entrepreneurship," Apr. 13, 2006. HBS Case no. 9-384-131.

Prahalad, C. K. and Hammond, Allen, *Serving the World's Poor, Profitably* Harvard Business Review September, 2002 pp. 4-11

Reading Questions:

- 1) What is the fundamental social justification for relying on market processes as a device for mobilizing and allocating natural and human resources to specific productive activities? Why do (some) societies think that free markets work to improve human welfare?
- 2) What role does profit motivated entrepreneurship play in the story of social value creation through markets? What role does a financially motivated capital market play in supporting and disciplining entrepreneurs with commercial ideas?
- 3) Are there significant market opportunities that the real institutions of global capitalism have missed? If so, why? What would be necessary to correct this error?
- 4) What role can the voluntary sector and government play in market finding and market development for business enterprises that disproportionately benefit social causes

such as poverty reduction, environmental protection, health promotion, or the reduction of inequality and social oppression?

Wednesday, November 10

19: Grameen Bank Revisited: Robustness and Sustainability

Case: Mohammed Yunus and the Grameen Bank (C, D)

Case Questions:

- 1) Who has owned and operated the Grameen Bank from its origins? For what purposes has it been operated? How were those purposes set? To whom were the leaders and managers of Grameen Bank accountable?
- 2) Has the Grameen Bank acquired equity over the years it has been operating up until 1983? By how much has its equity value increased do you think? Who do you think owns this equity? Does the equity give the owners financial claims on the organization? Does it give them control over Grameen's operations, and the distribution of financial returns?
- 3) What should the bargaining position of the Government be with respect to Grameen's proposal to go independent? Should they let it go, or not? Should they charge a price to Grameen, give it away free, or continue to subsidize it? What should Yunus and Grameen want? Why?
- 4) To best serve Yunus' goals, as you understand them, should the Grameen bank be incorporated as a for-profit or not-for-profit corporation? What real difference does this make?
- 5) How should Yunus construct the governance structures and processes of Grameen to ensure that it continues to be for the poor who are its principal clients and beneficiaries?

Readings:

Alice Oberfield and J. Gregory Dees, "Note on Starting a Nonprofit Venture" (Harvard Business School #9-391-096)

Reading Questions:

- 1) All societies make rules about the kinds of collective associations and organizations they will recognize as distinct social actors. By a distinct social actor I mean an entity that can be recognized in courts as something that own assets, can make binding contracts with others, and takes actions that can produce consequences for others for which they can held legally accountable. This is a necessary feature of a society that wants to be able to hold particular actors accountable for their actions in courts of law. For their part, indi-

viduals who want to create a collective enterprise have reasons to want to create social entities that can be distinguished from them as individuals. The main one being they would like to be able to depersonalize and collective their liability for the actions of the collective enterprise they are creating. But they would also like the organization to live on beyond their lives, and/or to be sold to others. Many societies make a distinction between for profit organizations on one hand, and nonprofit organizations on the other. What are the important distinctions among these different kinds of organizations? Are the most important distinctions legal or behavioral? What considerations should an entrepreneur have in mind when choosing to embrace a particular legal organizational form?

2) Legal form is one important feature of an organization. But this alone says relatively little about the structures and processes an organization will use to govern itself. These structures and processes are typically written into the founding documents of a collective enterprise. At a minimum, organizations have to name their officers – those individuals who act for the organization. They also have to give an address where they can be reached. Beyond that, organizations are pretty free to choose any structure and process of governance they want. They can choose a corporate form of governance with a small board, and a great deal of executive authority concentrated in the hands of a CEO. Or, they could choose to become a broad membership organization with both ownership of assets and decision rights within the organization broadly distributed across a large number of individual organizational stakeholders. What considerations should an entrepreneur have in mind when considering a particular structure and process of organizational governance?

3) How can one estimate the economic or social value of an organization? If a private, nonprofit organization has, over time, generated a significant amount of economic equity, who owns that equity? If the organization is sold to a for profit organization, should the public be compensated for the investment it made in the organization? If a publicly supported organization is spun off to become a private for profit or non-profit organization, how much should it have to pay the government for the initial public support?

Monday November 15

20. Using Markets to Make Change

Case: Aravind Eye Hospital, Madurai, India: In Service for Sight (*HBS Case # 593-098*)

Case Questions:

1) How would you evaluate Dr. V as a social entrepreneur? What social or public value is he creating? How is the production of that value being supported? Do you think he has a sustainable and scalable idea? How big can he get?

- 2) What kind of an organization is he running? Is it a private commercial enterprise, a nonprofit voluntary organization, or a quasi-governmental organization? What characteristics of the organization are you thinking about as you try to make these distinctions?
- 3) What do you think of the strategy of offering two different classes of service for two different client groups? What are the strengths and weaknesses of this approach? Could he pursue this strategy if he were running a government agency? How about if the government was contributing funding on some basis to the enterprise?
- 4) How should the government respond to Aravind Eye and Ear? How should the Health Minister of India view its growth?

Readings:

Tapping Financial Resources: Lessons from Social Entrepreneurship (Excerpted from: John Elkington, Pamela Hartigan, *The Power of Unreasonable People: How Social Entrepreneurs Create Markets that Change the World*) Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Business Press, ISBN-13:978-1-4221-8031-0, 8027BC

Reading Questions:

- 1) To what extent do social change organizations need money to achieve their objectives? What, if anything, is the problem of relying primarily on voluntary efforts of various kinds? What difficulties arise once money is brought into the organization and begins to shape its operations?
- 2) In general, what are possible sources of funding to organizations that seek to make social changes? Are there reasons to prefer some forms of funding over others? What are these?
- 3) To what extent do social change agents have to become skilled cost accountants and financial managers as well as charismatic social leaders?

Wednesday, Nov. 17

21. Private Money for Public Change: Two Models of Philanthropy

Readings:

Covington, Sally. *Moving a Public Policy Agenda: The Strategic Philanthropy of Conservative Foundations* (National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, July 1997).

Venture Philanthropy Partners. Selections from *High Engagement Philanthropy: A Bridge to a More Effective Social Sector* (March 2004): 7-22, 55-72.

URL: <http://www.vpppartners.org/learning/reports/report2004/report2004.pdf>

Reading Questions:

- 1) Sally Covington argues, to use a term latter developed by Sidney Blumenthal, that conservative philanthropy amounts to a vast “right wing conspiracy.” Is that just another term for effective social change agents?
- 2) She characterizes mainstream liberal philanthropy as “pragmatic.” What are the characteristics of this liberal pragmatic philanthropy?
- 3) Does the venture philanthropy strategy articulated in “High Engagement Philanthropy” escape the problems with liberal-pragmatic philanthropy? Is venture philanthropy attractive as a social change strategy?
- 4) With enough philanthropic resources, would it be possible to use the strategies that Covington identifies to create a vast “left wing conspiracy?” Or, are there asymmetries between the two broad agendas (e.g. reducing the size and scope of government versus developing government that works in egalitarian and effective ways) that make it impossible to apply the conservative philanthropic strategies?
- 5) If you had \$100 million as a philanthropist interested in sparking social change, would you invest it in “moving a public policy agenda” using the strategies described by Covington or in a venture strategy such as that described in the VPP report?

Further Reading [not provided]:

Jeff Krehely, Meaghan House and Emily Kernan. *Axis of Ideology: Conservative Foundations and Public Policy*. (National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, March 2004).

Sidney Blumenthal, *The Rise of the Counter-Establishment: The Conservative Ascent to Political Power* (original 1986, new version: Union Square Press, 2008).

T Medvetz, The Strength of Weekly Ties [On Grover Norquist and Americans for Tax Reform], *Politics & Society* 2006.

Monday, Nov. 22

22. Using Professional Ideology and Networks to Make Social Change: Changing the Field of Policing

Case: The Spread of Community Policing (Readings)

Mark H. Moore and George L. Kelling, "The Evolving Strategy of Policing", *Perspectives on Policing*, November(2), (Cambridge: Program in Criminal Justice Policy, 1988), pp. 1 - 15.

Jeffrey A. Roth, Joseph F. Ryan, et al, "National Evaluation of the COPs Program – Title I of the 1994 Crime Act." National Institute of Justice: August 2000)

Archon Fung. Selections from Chapter 2, "Down to the Neighborhoods" in *Empowered Participation: Reinventing Urban Democracy* (Princeton, 2004): 44-56; 63-68 (read sections 2.4-2.8; 2.10-2.11).

Goldstein, Herman. "On Further Developing Problem-Oriented Policing: The Most Critical Need, the Major Impediments, and a Proposal." *Crime Prevention Studies* 15 (2003): 13-47.

Case Questions:

- 1) Why did police departments all look pretty much the same, despite high decentralization and autonomy, by 1970?
- 2) In the 1980s, police reformers had very different notions of how to reinvent policing. What is the difference between the problem-oriented, broken-windows, and community-centered versions described in the readings?
- 3) Which strategy is most likely to result in substantial valuable social change? What is the value proposition?
- 4) Which strategy (if any) were/are police departments most likely to adopt?
- 5) What are the tools and strategies available to move the field from traditional to community policing?

Readings:

DiMaggio, Paul, and Walter W. Powell. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48 (1983): 147-60.

Mark H. Moore, Learning While Doing

Reading Questions:

- 1) What do you think of the claim that organizations pursue "legitimacy" more avidly than performance, and that the way they gain legitimacy is to operate pretty much like everyone else does? If this were true, what would it mean for the efficiency of private

- sector organizations in searching for and finding improved methods of producing particular goods and services?
- 2) Suppose that organizations gain legitimacy partly through real performance, and partly by imitating other organizations in the field. Suppose farther that some organizations were better able to monitor performance than others. If organizations cannot monitor performance very well, or choose not to, what would that imply for the degree to which they focused on either performance or imitation as a way of gaining legitimacy? What would that mean for the long run performance of the organizations that had difficulty measuring performance?
 - 3) One important way that the Federal Government often seeks to stimulate innovation and change in particular social sectors is through some combination of financing social research and development on one hand, and providing financial incentives to organizations that embrace favored new processes. If you were giving advice to the Secretary of Education about how to design the “Race to the Top Initiative” to improve schooling, or to the Director of the White House Office of Social Entrepreneurship about how to help bring promising ideas in the public sector to scale, what would you say? Does the federal government have much leverage here? What can it do to maximize its leverage?

Wednesday, Nov. 25 — NO CLASS — Thanksgiving Vacation

Part IV:

An Exercise in Social Change: Transforming the K-12 Educational Sector

Monday, November 27

23. Learning How to Diagnose a Complex Social Production System

(Materials to Be Distributed Later)

Wednesday, Dec. 1

24: Figuring Out How to Exert Leverage From Particular Social and Institutional Positions

(Materials to Be Distributed Later)

