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LEADERSHIP, DIALOGUE, AND CHANGE

This is a course about the tradition and strategies of *leadership based on dialogue* and how this powerful counter-rhetoric organizes people to work together on complex problems through problem-posing, pragmatic inquiry, and the inclusion of marginalized perspectives. By studying contemporary leadership theory and the American tradition of prophetic pragmatism, we explore ways everyday people can act on commitments and create change. Students will work as rhetorical consultants, learning methods for intercultural rhetorical research and developing a Community Think Tank on a current issue.

**Leadership as a Process of Dialogue and Inquiry**

Recent theories of leadership have redefined the critical work of effective/adaptive leaders in new terms, that is, as a challenge to orchestrate *dialogue* and *inquiry* into the *hard* problems a group faces. We will draw on the work of Ronald Heifetz and the Harvard Center for Public Leadership to study this essentially rhetorical aspect of leadership and to interpret your own experience.

# American Pragmatism: Philosophical Foundations for Inquiry

The tradition of American philosophical pragmatism is a tradition of *inquiry* into differences that make a difference. One foundation of this tradition is laid in the lives and writing of the New England social critics—especially Emerson and Thoreau—leading up to the Civil War. For them the rhetoric of making a difference is driven by two conflicting but complementary impulses— critique and non-conformity, on the one hand, and commitment, connection and community on the other. The question these New England transcendentalists pose to us is, what *form* should critique and commitment take—questions which the writers we read answer in strikingly different ways.

In 1907 William James argued for philosophical “pragmatism” as a counter-theory of truth—an “attitude of looking away from first things, principles, categories, supposed necessities, and of looking toward last things, fruits, consequences, facts.” And in the influential hands of John Dewey this “attitude” laid the groundwork for a new vision of progressive education, social inquiry, and cultural critique. Cornel West’s contemporary prophetic pragmatism takes us into America’s ongoing struggle with difference, asserting the agency of everyday people in the face of injustice. We will look at what writers, activists, and everyday people, standing in different convictional communities, operating in different fields of action, have made of this tradition—in the Civil War 1850s, in the Civil Rights 1960s, and the present.

# The Rhetorical Tool Kit and The Field of Action

The rhetoric of leadership and making a difference is a situated rhetoric—it is a way of responding to your own time and place. It adapts to the field of action you have entered and the network of people to whom you speak. We will build our own toolkit of research strategies and rhetorical moves by looking first, at the moves other people have made in

different fields of action.

* Ralph Waldo Emerson in the lecture hall and journal, Henry David Thoreau in the woods, and Margaret Sanger in storefront clinics and politics;
* Martin Luther King and Malcolm X in political action for civil rights & Saul Alinsky in radical action for community organizing;
* Cornel West and bell hooks as border crossing writers, professors, public intellectuals, and prophetic pragmatists;
* College students and faculty in mentoring and inquiry with an urban community.

Then, in your own field of action, you will be able to create a community problem-solving dialogue with partners in a campus or local community. You will learn a variety of research strategies for mounting an inquiry with diverse participants. And will use the rhetorical tools you have learned to create a Briefing Book and community dialogue that allows multiple stakeholders to better understand their problem, their options, and the consequences of action.

Books for the course (available in CMU Online bookstore)

bell hooks, *Talking Back.* South End Press

Recommended

Sharon Parks, *Leadership Can Be Taught,* Harvard Business School

Ronald Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, Harvard University Press

Cornel West*, Keeping Faith.* Routledge

### Other Readings (available on Canvas [C] or reserve)

Linda Flower, *Problem Solving Strategies for Writing in College & Community (PSSW)*

Ronald Heifetz, from *Leadership without Easy Answers*

Sharon Parks, from *Leadership Can Be Taught,*

Ralph Waldo Emerson, “Self-Reliance”

Henry David Thoreau, “Where I Lived and What I Lived For” from *Walden*

Walt Whitman, excerpts from *Leaves of Grass,* 1855

Martin Luther King, “Letter from Birmingham Jail,” “I Have a Dream” speech

Saul Alinsky, from *Rules for Radicals*

Cornel West*,* from *Keeping Faith* and the *Cornel West Reader*

Spinosa et al, from *Disclosing New World*

Michael Lerner , from *Jews and Blacks*

Linda Flower, Elenore Long, Lorraine Higgins*,* from *Learning to Rival: Literate Practice for Intercultural Inquiry*

Linda Flower, “Talking Across Difference” CCC 9/03. “Creating Controversy” 12/12

Yrjo Engestrom, “Developmental Studies of Work” in *Understanding Practice*

Linda Flower, “Intercultural Knowledge Building”http://wac.colostate.edu/books/selves\_societies/

Intercultural Inquiry http://english.cmu.edu/research/inquiry/default.html

Carnegie Mellon Community Think Tank [www.cmu.edu/thinktank](http://www.cmu.edu/thinktank)

*Guide to Creating a Community Think Tank*

Susan Swan, “Rhetoric, Service, and Social Justice” *WC* Jan.2002

David Coogan, “Service Learning & Social Change” *CCC* June 2006

Lindsey Wotanis, A Guide to *Rhetorical Consultation*

Eli Goldblatt, “Alinsky’s Reveille,” *CE,* Jan. 2005

**I. THEORIES OF DIALOGIC LEADERSHIP AND CHANGE**

**September Tu. 28 Introduction**

# Th 30. The “Rhetoric” of Making a Difference

As a writer (rhetor) you are probably most experienced with the kinds of problem-solving strategies that academic writing requires (and rewards). But what if you were “writing to make a difference” in a wider, community setting? Compare the accounts of writers in action in Chapters 1 and 14. What makes an effective writer in these contrastive settings? Come prepared to support an argument for what you think are the top two strengths or key strategies in each setting.

Then, to build the connections between rhetors and leadership, write the *Initial Analysis* section of your Leadership Case Study, Questions 1-4. (See Inquiries for details)

**Read**: from Linda Flower, *Problem Solving Strategies for Writing (PSSW)[on* C ]

Ch. 1 A Portrait of Writers in Action p3-25

Ch. 14. Out of the Classroom and into the Community p310-321

**Prepare**: To compare rhetorical work in academic and community settings.

**DUE**: **Leadership Case Study.** (Initial Analysis. 2 pages)

# Sept Tu 4. Theories of Leadership

**Read**: Ronald Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers.* Chapter 1 & p128-9. [C]

**Prepare**: What would Heifetz say about the leadership experience in your case study?

# Th. 6 Case-in-Point-Analysis

Read the account of Margaret Sanger (in Heifetz) as an analysis of a rhetorical consultant at work (i.e., imagine you had her job). What could you learn from her experience? Why do you think Heifetz chose to profile her?

**Read**: Sharon Parks, p6-11; 19-24; 61-68 from *Leadership Can Be Taught* [C]

 Ronald Heifetz, Ch 8 p183-189; 194-201 from *Leadership* [C]

 Collaborative Consultation on a Case Study [C]

# Prepare: To participate in the Session 1 collaborative consultation on your case study.

**DUE: Additional Analysis of Adaptation and Authority (draft)**

Based on these readings, add a 1 ½ -2-page analysis of authority and adaptation in your Case Study (see Question 5 in the assignment discussion at the back). Consider the distinctions between authority and leadership and technical problems versus adaptive challenges. What role did these distinctions play in your case? Use these concepts to build a more theoretically sophisticated or probing explanation of the problems you faced.

# September

# Tu.11 Dialogue and Inquiry

These readings sketch some different forms inquiry and dialogue can take. We will start the discussion with observations: What part does “rivaling” take in your intellectual work? Can you find rivals in your case study, in a recent academic paper, or non-academic discussion? How are they introduced and used; to what effect? Then we will develop our own hypotheses: rival hypothesis thinking may be critical to inquiry, but how can leaders get groups to go from advocacy to rivaling?

By the way, what is an “inquiry” anyway? Does it differ from typical academic papers? And what does the conclusion of an inquiry look like, if it isn’t an “answer”?

**Read**: Flower, Long, Higgins*, Learning to Rival.* Ch 1 & 2. [C]

 *PSSW* Ch 17. Dialogue and Inquiry, p413-428 [C]

# Prepare: To participate in the Session 2 collaborative consultation on your case study.

**DUE: Additional Analysis of Collaboration and the Process of Inquiry (draft)**

Based on these readings, add a 1½ -2-page analysis of collaboration and inquiry. Use a paragraph to consider the role each of these played in your original case. Then, think about your own process of *writing this case study.* Use your understanding of both collaboration and inquiry to analyze this dimension of how your own inquiry *for this paper* worked.

**The final 6-7-page written version of your Case Study will be due next class**.

Include a final 1 page reflection on (1) what you make of this case study now; what it reveals and on (2) the Collaborative Consultation process itself—its strengths, weaknesses, how to make it work best (Question 7).

## Th 13. Leadership through the Practice of Deliberative Dialogue

**Read:** Flower, “Difference-Driven Inquiry” [C]

Think Tank Inquiry Process HO [C] and *Think Tank Guide* [C]

Lindsey Wotanis, “A Guide to Rhetorical Consultation” [C]

**Preview:** the Think Tank Finding: “Experiences and Struggles of Independent Students” for the how it models and invites dialogue [http://www.cmu.edu/thinktank/docs.html ]

# DUE: Final Written Case Study of Leadership

**AFTER THIS CLASS Begin Your Think Tank Inquiry:** Generate some different initial hypotheses about *Self-Advocacy—*Who needs this skill; under what Circumstances; and How is it done? Talk informally to at least 5 people. Is there a felt problem here?

***1. Inquiry****.* Start by collecting info for the Fact Sheet on what is available. Then ask students about their experience. (Always start with an open question, but then you could use your fact list to prompt for their experiences with those sources.)

***2. Your initial hypothesis.***  What are your initial insights on when and how do students need to be Self-Advocates. Does it matter?

Begin to collect info for your Fact Sheet. And preview the more formal Critical Incident interviews we will conduct next. *Think Tank Guide,* Doc 1.3 & Doc. 2.1 [C]

 **II. THE RHETORIC OF MAKING A DIFFERENCE**

**And AMERICAN PRAGMATISM**

# Tu 18. The Manifesto of American Pragmatism

Turning their backs to the traditions of Europe and facing the wrenching divisiveness of the impending Civil War, Emerson, Thoreau, Whitman framed the rhetoric of making a difference in terms of four contradictory/complementary ideals: relating to society through **non-conformity** and **critique.** Yet also taking action based on **conviction** and seeking **connection.**

The question for today is: what did these ideas/ideals mean for them in their field of action? In particular, where does **transformation** actually begin; where is it located? If you asked Emerson and Thoreau to weigh in on your inquiry into making a difference, what would they say to you?

**Read:** Ralph Waldo Emerson, “Self Reliance” [C]

Notes on Emerson. Cornel West from *American Evasion* p14-18 [C]

Henry David Thoreau, “Where I Lived and What I Lived For” p56-68 & “Conclusion” p 218-221 from *Walden* [C]

Rec: Thoreau, “Economy” from *Walden* and “Civil Disobedience [C]

 Whitman, Excerpts from *Leaves of Grass* [C]

**Prepare:** Consider some tensions in the transcendentalist vision. Is self-reliance just another name for rampant, self-serving individualism? How does Emerson and Thoreau’s vision of looking within the self meet the challenge of achieving mystic vision—a state in which, according to Emerson:

 a) mean egotism vanishes (see West, p 18) and

 b) we are acting with *his* definition of “Reason” (“an instantaneous in-streaming causing power”) as well as merely rational “understanding”? (West p.16)

A second tension: does Emerson’s desire to celebrate a moral (i.e., transgressive) vision and Thoreau’s retreat come at the expense of social action and a sense of community? How do you respond?

## Th 20. The Field of Action 100 Years Later—The Civil Rights Movement

As we watch the historical documentary in Eyes on the Prize, note what form non-conformity and critique is taking in the 1960’s field of action. What are the moves in this rhetoric which are open to everyday people?

**Read:** Cornel West. From The Paradox of the African American Rebellion, p271-284 [C]

**September**

From Spinosa et al, *Disclosing New Worlds*

**See:** *Eyes on the Prize* :”No Easy Walk (1962-1966)”

**Post Initial Hypotheses by Friday evening; read before next class.** Document the hypotheses you turned up: When is self-advocacy needed; how does it work? What are the problems?

# Tu 25. The Rhetoric of Conviction and Connection

What is the pragmatic “meaning of love” in King’s thinking? What does this discourse enable? What does it disable? Does it open up rhetorical moves for everyday people, or only for leaders, preachers, or culture figures? This will be a critical question for your inquiry.

**Read:** Martin Luther King, “Letter from Birmingham Jail”

 “I Have a Dream” speech

 Posted Initial Hypotheses

#

# Th 27. A Rival Rhetoric of Community Organizing

Alinsky presents an alternative image of community organizing. Is King using the rhetoric of vision or of shrewd conflict manipulation? What moves could you use?

**Read:** From Saul Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals* [C]

Explore the entire Think Tank web site, review the process,then read “Experiences and Struggles of Independent Students” in the *Findings,* focusing this time on theproblem definitions [www.cmu.edu/thinktank/docs.html](http://www.cmu.edu/thinktank/docs.html) .

**DUE/POST**: Your Individual Proposal of Problem Themes. Read and try to group our informal data into categories or themes. Use these to name & propose a set of 2 or 3 key problems that could be the focus of a team’s inquiry—and the basis for forming teams at the end of class. (1 page) Post your brief proposal before class and bring a paper copy to turn in.

 On the basis of our discussion today, form your working teams. Meet briefly to 1) name your team, 2) elect a moderator, 3) consolidate ideas on the part of the problem you want to work on and 4) plan how to brainstorm/collect potential contacts to include in your group memo due next week.

**Review:** On naming a problem in Flower, Difference-Driven Inquiry”, pp 323-325

**Rec**: Flower, “Analyzing a Problem” PSSW Ch 8 [C]

# OCTOBER

# Tu 2. The Rhetoric of Prophetic Pragmatism

This stance is perhaps best described as a balancing act in the midst of tensions and contradictions. Consider how its two defining terms and 4 key concepts (in **bold)** are expressed in context. How many features does your style of action typically embody?

**Read:** Cornel West, from *Keeping Faith* Ch 7 p107-111; Ch 8 p131-134; Ch9 p139-141 And from the *Cornel West Reader: “*Introduction” p 1-11 [C]

Thesesections talk about how one can still act given the inevitability of evil and the loss a religious or philosophical certainty. These selections focus on the response of pragmatism, West’s critical/historicist perspective on religion, and the critical temper of a prophetic stance.

Michael Lerner , from *Jews and Blacks* [C]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Prophetic** | **Pragmatism** |
| A relentless & compassionate **critique** of injustice | Has a **vision** of alternative reality & transformative praxis | An **inquiry** stance  | Locates meaning in action & in **consequences** |
| Expressed in resistance and struggle | Rooted in• democratic faith• Christian tradition  of love and justice• struggle with a  sense of evil | Rooted in• an experimental  way of knowing• fallibility• humility | Observed in social, historical & cultural contexts |

**Prepare:** How would you explain what is significant about prophetic pragmatism to either 1) a fundamentalist (of any stripe—political, religious, philosophical) or 2) a cynic, or nihilist? What aspect of prophetic pragmatism speaks most strongly to you, given your different background and field of action?

**Th 4 Culture Workers Build Representations**

West describes “ a new kind of **culture** **worker**,” who can “understand, analyze, and enact representational practices” (p21). He seems to have special critics and artists in mind, yet this sounds like the work of a rhetor/writer more generally. Does it make sense—realistically—for an everyday college student (or young professional) to see him/herself as this kind of “new” culture worker responding to West’s “political challenge” (p. 28)? Or is this a job for the pros?

West devotes most of this article to describing a “new cultural politics of difference” that is focused on the “**representations**” of marginalized people. Since we all engage in the politics of difference and the act of representing others, the question to us is: what are we doing and how aware are we of the “political” meaning of our choices.

**Read**: Cornel West, *Keeping Faith*, “The New Cultural Politics of Difference” Ch1 p3-32

 Richard Rorty [C]

 *PSSW* Ch 14 p310-321 [C]

**October**

**Prepare:** Re-read the vignettes in *PSSW* as possible examples of West’s “new cultural politics.” Do you see conflicting *representations* at work? Does anyone here take up West’s “political challenge” (p.28-32)? If you think so, which of his 4 key features are the most significant?

**Schedule ahead** : Set up a collaborative planning session with a partner of your choice for the small window of time, after next Tuesday’s class on CP and before the draft of your Inquiry on Everyday People is due on Thursday.

**DUE/ POST**: A Working Proposal by the Team. Post and give me a 1 page group memo naming your team, the team members and the problem *as you currently see it*, noting some potential clients or users of your work to help focus your sense of the problem.

Use *TT Guide* Doc. 2.1 and attach a list of intended contacts for Critical Incident interviews with a brief justification of what these choices offer you, in terms of representativeness, special perspectives, etc. You should **schedule** these interviews **now**, since they will start in Week 6, right after our class on methods .

**III. STRATEGIES FOR RHETORICAL ACTION**

**Tu 9 Building Knowledge—Collaboratively**

We begin the Strategies section looking at collaboration in two contexts: in your own writing and in the Think Tank project. First, observe your planning process for the mid-term Inquiry paper due shortly. Next, look at how the Think Tank works as collaborative process of understanding and acting on a community problem.

**Read:** Flower & Ackerman, *Writers at Work*, “Collaborative Planning.” p 120-140

 *PSSW* Ch 18 Community Problem-Solving Dialogues [C]

**DUE:** Bring informal but written planning notes or text for the mid-term Inquiry due next. Identify the significant issues and options you want to explore in this paper and some of the strong rivals you want to consider.

**Hold a CP session with your partner BEFORE THURSDAY.**

**Th. 11 Reflecting on Your Knowledge-Building Process & TT Class #1**

What strategies do you rely on? Why is it hard to frame a Think Tank problem?

**Read**: *PSSW.* Ch 10. Writing Reader-Based Prose [C]

 Ch 8. Analyzing a Problem [C]

**Prepare:** A 2-minute organized reflection on the CP session. What did you

discover about your own writing/planning process? How well did your partnership focus on a Plan To Do? How could you improve your CP session?

**Also Prepare:** A 1-minute oral update also in class on your thinking about being a self-advocate. Describe the team problem as *you* see it now. Then pose a genuine *open question* that is motivating your inquiry.

**Post:** Your team’s completed list of C.I. interview contacts on your Doc. 2.1 chart

**DUE**: Inquiry into How Everyday People Make a Difference. In class or by Friday 5:00 pm ( Baker 145H or my mail box in 245 wing). And Update below.

# Tu 16 The Rhetoric of Talking Back

How is “talking back” different from what my Grandmother called “back talk?” What are the key moves in bell hooks’ rhetorical tool kit (compared, say, to a community problem-solving dialogue with its critical incident interviews)?

## Read: bell hooks, *Talking Back.* Chap. 1,2, 4, 5

**Read*:*** *Think Tank* *Guide* Docs 1.0-1.4; 2.1-2.3

**Prepare**: What is the Shared Problem as you now see it? Conduct your ‘test drive’ critical incident interview and prepare for the analysis due next week. We will discuss your insight into successful techniques in class.

**MAKE SURE YOUR INTERVIEWS ARE SCHEDULED NOW**

**to START NEXT WEEK.** !!!

## Th 18 The University as a Field of Action

What would a “cultural worker in the everyday world” do at Carnegie Mellon?

**Read:** bell hooks, Chap. 11, 14, 21, 23

**DUE/POST**: An (individually written ½ page problem statement of the community concern your group plans to work on. This statement serves three purposes: it shares your current best thinking with your team, as you develop a joint analysis; it will give focus to the critical incident interviews; and it lets you work toward defining an *open question.* The test is: can you share this interpretation of the problem with at least two stakeholders who have *differing* viewpoints. Will *they* see this as a *shared problem—*not just your perspective? Post it by Friday.

**Then Read**: the entire set of statements to help expand your own group’s thinking and discover overlap or issues on which teams can collaborate.

**Begin:** writing the Fact Sheet for the Briefing Book. See the 2011 Independent Students Findings for an alternative model and the UPDATE [www.cmu.edu/thinktank]

**Plan** to complete a Critical Incident Interview and analysis **before** the next class.

**October**

**IV. CONDUCTING A COMMUNITY THINK TANK**

***Step 1. Understand the Context***

## Tu 23 Developing a Community Dialogue TT#2

Expand your Fact Sheet Doc.1.1. What is the problem; what are some issues or facts participants might want to know; what are some resources/ readings? We will compare your CI Interview results and techniques in class.

**Read:**  *PPSW* Ch 15 Observation, Reflection, and Conversation [C]

*Guide*  Docs 2.4-2.6. 3.1 and 5.1

**DUE**: **A formal Data Analysis using Doc 2.3 plus reflective comments** (1-2 pps).

 We will test drive the Critical Incident data collection process in Doc 2.1 and 2.3. Collect & systematically document critical incidents from someone in or related to your target group. In the Comments (that are a critical part of a CI interview), note not only the key points you think it revealed, but also include a reflection on your interview process—what did you learn about doing this sort of research that will make you more effective next time? Remember you will need a tape or computer to record CI interviews.

**BEGIN**: Your critical incident interviews right after this class

***Step 2. Find the Shared Problems***

**Th 25 Discovering and Documenting Diverse Representations TT#3**

Giveus an example of “situated knowledge” about your community problem that contrasts with more abstract representations of it.

**Read:** Flower. “Talking Across Difference & the Search for Situated Knowledge” [C]

Recommended: Yrjo Engestrom, “Developmental Studies of Work”

**DUE/POST:** A completed Fact Sheet to include in the Briefing Book

Bring your *Think Tank Guide* to class.

## Tu 30 Listening to Others TT #4

Why did the writers in Swan’s study fail to hear what their partners were saying?

What are the adaptive (vs technical) problems in your community issue? What would make your participants listen to each other?

**Read:** Susan Swan, “Rhetoric, Service, and Social Justice” [C]

 Ronald Heifetz, Ch 4 p88-100 Tacoma case from *Leadership* [C]

**POST**: Your list of potential participants for the Round Table Sessions and the rationale.

**NOVEMBER**

***Step 3. Construct a Problem Scenario***

**Th 1 Developing Scenarios around Decision Points & Conflicts TT#5**

**Read:** Higgins and Brush, “Personal Experience Narrative and Public Debate” for a discussion of narrative technique [C]

*Guide*. Doc 3.1, 4.6, 5.1

 See scenarios in the Healthcare Findings [http://www.cmu.edu/thinktank/docs.html]

As you review the data that is due today, look for details that could go into scenario(s). You will need to create one (or two) complex events based on your data that

1) dramatize typical situations in which your problem comes to life

2) invite your readers to fill out the Story-behind-the-Story in these incidents, and

3) illustrate some of the conflicts that surround this situations (Remember, a good scenario has NO SINGLE RIGHT RESPONSE so watch out for moralizing.) Design your scenario to draw people into a dialogue in which they actually start to build a negotiated meaning, that is, in which they grapple with good rivals surrounding this issue.

This will be a team planning class. By the end you should have a rough sketch of your scenario. So it is imperative that you have your CI data analysis completed.

**DUE**: Come with 2 themes that meet the criteria above & a typed data analysis of your CI interviews, using the rubric in Doc. 2.3. Type out “quotable” bits ; paraphrase others with enough detail to be understandable. In the Comments by the Analyst area, note ways you might group or ***name problem clusters and possible decision points.*** Use Doc 3.1 to guide your planning session.

**POST** Scenario Themes. Post your problem clusters before class on Canvas. And bring in a hardcopy for sharing with your team. It is helpful to have 1 or more laptops to view posts & record plans and drafts.

**SCHEDULE your Round Table Session now:** Many people will *need* a two week lead time to commit to this meeting. Others will appreciate it.

***Step 4. Get the Story-Behind-the-Story***

**Tu 6 Documenting Knowledge Making & Finding Shared Problems TT#6**

**Read** : *Guide* Doc 5.1, 5.2, (Preview 6.1, 6.2, 7.1 for where we are heading)

 “ Intercultural Knowledge Building: The Literate Action of A Community Think Tank.” Down load the PDF file (you will need a computer with Acrobat installed) from<http://wac.colostate.edu/books/selves_societies/> (note underscore between /selves and society). Focus on Sections I. Designing an Intercultural Forum and II. Designing a Dialogue to Use Difference.

**DUE:** A written (draft) section of the Briefing Book text that poses your framing problem or open question and a draft of one scenario. Have you used the Template?

**November**

**POST**: The results of your Round Table Scheduling including names and contact information on all participants

**In Class:** After discussing how a Briefing Book works as a *meditational tool* we will use this study to test how your draft tracks 3 areas of contradiction or conflict in: representations of the problem, discourse, notions of the goal. We will compare responses to your invitation and plan how to manage the event.

 (Keep collecting more SBStories for your final Guide.)

**Th 8 Uncovering Community Meanings & Testing Your Problem-Solving Frame TT#7**

What does leadership mean/do in this vision of social change? If ideology as a form of received social knowledge can create community,

 but also impose (unquestioned) authority that provides its own justification, how should you manage this double edged tool?

**Read:** David Coogan, Service Learning and Social Change [C]

**DUE:** The formatted, revised draft.2 of your Briefing Book.

**In Class:**  We will use collaborative planning to test how your text works (or doesn’t yet) to support problem-solving: You partners will be asking you to show them your:

***Frames***:

Does it have an action focus?

 What (whose?) ideographs are you calling on?

 What question are your posing?

***Scaffold*** that can guide the group into problem-solving:

 Do multiple (and marginalized) voices represent the complexity of the problem?

 Whose good Rivals are raised ?

 Do competing Options work to elect Outcomes

***Step 5. Construct a Briefing Book***

**Tu 13 User Testing Your Briefing Book AND Facilitating Strategies TT#8**

**Read**: Doc. 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 This is your chance to try out your text and your personal facilitating techniques on readers in class.

A COMPLETED, FORMATTED BRIEFING BOOK, ready to mail ASAP after class which includes the introductory problem statement, scenario and any process prompts you plan to take (e.g., 4.6 or the 6.1 card). Give the Book to participants ASAP reminding them of the time and place and asking them to come with Options.

 AND your prepared oral introduction (see 6.1) to participants about the TT & the process and a scenario you are prepared to act out

**November**

**In Class:**  You will perform your introduction and one scenario, while the class takes the participant roles ( on 6.1 and 6.2). This will be your chance to practice the ‘expert facilitator’ moves (6.3)—swimming against the current.

***Step 6. Hold a Think Tank***

**WED 18 & TH 19 Hold Your Round Table Session**

No class meeting. Hold your Round Table Session(s) before the end of the week.

***Step 7. Document Your Findings***

**Tu 20 Debrief , Consolidate, and Name Options**

**Prepare:** Bring your TT notes and come ready to talk about the themes, the surprising findings, and the underlying conflicts and problems you are observing. When you look at your issue as a complex situated activity, what are the key features you see now? How does this compare to your predictions? In particular,what Options have emerged?

Spend the final part of the class planning how your team will divide up reviewing tapes, consolidating, and presenting what you have heard in the Think Tank.

**Th 22 THANKSGIVING**

**Tu 27 Teams Present Findings #1**

**Prepare** a formal presentation to us as fellow Rhetorical Consultants. That is, we need to hear about both the Findings from your specific project and about your insights into problems and strategies for conducting a successful deliberative dialogue.

**Th 29 Teams Present Findings #2**

**DECEMBER**

**Tu 4** **Present Your Personal Discoveries** **about Rhetoric and Leadership #1**

**Th 6** **Present Your Personal Discoveries** **about Rhetoric and Leadership #2**

**DUE: Thursday, December 13 5:00 pm**

Your Briefing Book and Findings plus individual Appendix

 Submit as a hard copy and a C attachment

Send me an individual email assessing of the kind and level of contribution each member of the team made to this project. Estimate the per cent of total effort (it should add up to 100%!). Feel free to nominate an MVP.

#### Inquiry into The Rhetoric of Leadership and Dialogue

Submit a hard copy

**INQUIRIES**

The writing for this course is designed as a cumulative series of inquiries. The goal of this series is to let you engage in a dialogue with the people we read and others in the class and to help you consolidate what you are learning into a progressively more elaborated rhetorical toolkit. Please see the Policy on Disability, Well-being and Integrity on Canvas.

**Discussion Questions**

On the syllabus, the topic for each class is followed by a brief set of study & discussion questions. Although you will obviously read these rich texts in light of your own interests, please come *prepared with written or mental notes* to make your *contribution* to the issue raised in the discussion questions. By coming prepared to offer a concise and thoughtful hypothesis or idea (which may also be tentative, questioning, still-under-negotiation), *you* will turn this class from a recitation into a genuine dialogue. The same expectations apply to group work.

**Case Study of Leadership**

*The Initial Analysis.* Write a brief case study (2 pages, 1.5 spacing) of a time you tried to take leadership—when the attempt didn’t quite work. In fact, it may have bombed. Heifetz argues that people learn performance skills like leadership best from trying and then building on their own experience—and failures. Use what is called a “critical incident” strategy to interview yourself. That is, tell this story as a specific “critical incident” focused on specific details: describe the interaction, record what people actually did and said in their own language, then try to reveal/infer the thoughts that lay behind the words or actions wherever you can. The goal is to craft a well-specified incident that locates your rhetorical act in a specific field of action.

At the same time, in order to create an *analysis* of leadership (not just a story), ask yourself to respond to these key questions:

1. How did you see your role at the time?
2. What did you value, care about, or feel committed to? What did others in this event value, care about, or feel committed to?
3. What did you want to happen? How did others respond? What *did* happen?
4. Any hypotheses about why? Any *rival*  hypotheses?

*For your Additional Analyses*. In response to further readings, add two additional sections to our case study (1½ -2 pages each), focused on these questions:

# What can the distinction between authority and leadership and between technical problems versus adaptive challenges help explain?

# What role did the process and presence (absence) of collaboration and inquiry play?

1. Finally, what do you make of this case now? (1) On what it reveals?

 (2) And on the Collaborative Consultation process itself—its strengths, weaknesses, how to make it work best .

# The case study will be developed in stages described in the syllabus. The final 6-7 page version will be due the class after your final Collaborative Consultation.

# Criteria for grading: a closely observed case; an analysis guided by a rigorous use of the 7 questions and/or categories of analysis posed in the assignment, and a thoughtful, questioning, rivaling reflection. (15 points)

# An Inquiry into How Everyday People Make a Difference

Develop a rival hypothesis dialogue in which you engage with at least 4 distinctive people/perspectives (from among Heifetz, Emerson or Thoreau, Flower, et al., King, Alinksy, and West) on the question: how can (can?) “everyday people” (who may have little power or authority) make a difference using the tools of rhetoric? What is the key to such leadership or action? You may wish to focus this discussion on a particular situation or problem you are especially interested in thinking through, using it as a case in point.

What do you see as the *significant options* each of your chosen writers raises for someone trying to answer this question? Allow each to speak from his or her strength, with their own language and key concepts. I encourage you to design this inquiry as an imagined dialogue not just an essay: use direct quotation or paraphrase, and include your own supported position as well. However, what is critical is that you enter the dialogue as an *interpreter* who constantly steps back to explain what the quotations, paraphrases, and the dialogue as a whole (which you, of course, constructed) reveals.

Keep focused on what you see as the significant options, discussing them in enough depth to really explore their meaning and genuine rivals. The goal of this assignment is to let you construct an intellectual scaffold for own inquiry—one that does justice to the ideas of serious thinkers and to your own purpose in entering a dialogue with them.

Here are some criteria for evaluating yourself and supporting your collaborative partner, based on the requests in the assignment.

* Did you maintain a real dialogue between perspectives on a significant issue? Did you let them go into any depth with each other?
* Were you able to use the language and claims of your writers in precise ways that did justice to the complexity of their thought (rather than just expressing their “drift”)?
* Did you bravely entertain real rivals to an initial position (not just throwaway lines, but ones the initial speaker would have given serious thought to)?
* Did the dialogue on each issue “add up”? Did you as a writer use it to articulate a new level of understanding of that issue?

8 pages. 1 ½ spaced. 25 points

# Briefing Book and Findings with Appendix

Your term project will culminate in a ***Briefing Book*** and a ***Findings*** report to submit to your community group. See [www.cmu.edu/thinktank](http://www.cmu.edu/thinktank) for examples. Submit a paper copy to me and post an electronic attachment on C from your group. 25 points

Submit an individual **Appendix on Canvas** documenting your personal Research Data. 5 points.

1. Problem Statement

2. Participation List

3. CI Data Analysis with Reflection

4. Three (3) additional CI Data Analyses

5. Interview notes from SBS sessions

6. Notes from Round Table sessions

Since you worked on a team, email me a **memo** assessing the kind and level of contribution each member made to this project. Give your estimate of the per cent of total effort (it should add up to 100%!). Feel free to nominate an MVP.

# Personal Inquiry into The Rhetoric of Leadership and Dialogue

As we moved from reading and writing to action and writing, what has this experience added to your understanding of leadership and your rhetorical tool kit of ideas, and stances and strategies for making a difference? Use this final inquiry to explore your own personal discoveries and to consolidate for yourself and others your best thinking on the rhetoric of leadership, dialogue, and the process of change, as it is carried out by everyday people. Develop/test your ideas with concrete examples drawn from a specific field of action—considering rivals to your own best ideas. 4 pages. 20 points

**Format**

* To allow room for comments on your papers, please use 1.5 spacing and normal margins. To conserve paper, print double sided whenever you can.
* Post most entries on Canvas as direct text. Only post attachments when you are sharing formatted project work.
* Formatting the Findings: You may find the format used in the Carnegie Mellon Think Tank Findings (see Guide Doc 5.1) helpful. It is not required. However the following elements must appear in some clear way:
* A problem scenario and analysis organized around decision points or actions
* Multiple voices identified in some way by role or perspective
* Rival SBS interpretations elaborated with situated knowledge
* Alternative Options and Outcomes
* Introductory statement and acknowledgment of participants

**Grades:**

Because of the collaborative nature of this course, a grade of C or above requires that you come *prepared* to participate in/contribute to all classes and meet the deadlines for handing in and posting all Inquiries and Discovery Memos. Two or more unexcused absences will lower your grade. Coming *prepared to contribute* to the day’s question will raise grades on the margin. Written work is weighted as follows:

Prepared class contribution 10 points

Case Study of Leadership 15 points

Inquiry into How Everyday People Make a Difference 25 points

Think Tank Briefing Book and Findings 25 points

Think Tank Research Appendix 5 points

Personal Inquiry into the Rhetoric of Leadership and Dialogue 20 points