

## **Environmental Policy Deliberation (4 cr) Spring 2014**

### **COURSE PLAN**

Lectures and tutoring sessions: We, Th 14-16, seminar room, Snellmaninkatu 10, 1st floor (12 March – 15 May 2014, SEE DETAILED SCHEDULE BELOW)

Responsible teacher: Dr. Mikko Rask, tel. 050 3222 012, Email [mikko.rask@helsinki.fi](mailto:mikko.rask@helsinki.fi), homepage <http://www.kuluttajatutkimuskeskus.fi/index.phtml?s=160/>, student consulting by appointment only.

Course assistant: Dr. Nina Honkela, Email [nina.honkela@helsinki.fi](mailto:nina.honkela@helsinki.fi), tel. 191 24561  
Address: University of Helsinki, Faculty of Social Sciences, PO Box 16 (Snellmaninkatu 10), 00014 University of Helsinki.

Course homepage: <https://weboodi.helsinki.fi/>

### **Objective and content**

The course focuses on the understanding and resolution of environmental policy problems at the individual level and in collaboration between experts and stakeholders. Participants learn to appreciate the significance of *framing* in environmental policy, that is, alternative ways of articulating what a particular environmental issue is all about. Topics include characteristics of modern environmental problems, also called as “wicked problems” (framing the problems); styles of decision making and dialogue between facts and values in environmental policy (framing rationality); environmental policy deliberation as power (framing power); as well as an introduction to the Joint Fact Finding (JFF) process as an example of a best practice of environmental deliberation, and a discussion of the methodological issues related to the application of such methods in environmental policy making.

### **Requirements**

In addition to lectures, successful passing of the course requires (1) active participation in all lectures and tutoring sessions, (2) systematic reading of course literature on environmental policy deliberation, (3) group assignment and report on a case involving collective environmental policy deliberation, (4) individually written diary on personal deliberation during the course. There is a reading assignment from course literature each week. Student evaluation is based on individual diaries (50%) and group assignment (50%). To ensure effective group work, access to the course is limited to the first 30 registrants.

#### *Group report on collective deliberation*

Course participants take part in a simulation of a *joint fact finding* exercise on the planned construction of a gold mine in Kuusamo. Participants are divided into groups of 5-6 experts representing different fields of expertise: a mining engineer, an ecologist, an entrepreneur in tourism, a representative of forest owners, a municipal policy maker, and a local resident. Each group produces its own fact finding report and presents it orally with a slide show at the end of the course. The group work proceeds during 5 sessions: (1) introduction to group work and its topic, (2) learning and competence building session among individuals representing the same experts, (3) scoping session among mixed expert groups focusing on the definition of the main problems, (4) negotiation session focusing on the definition of the action recommendations, and (5) group presentations. The deliverables of the group work are 2 pages (single spaced, 12 pt Times Roman) summary report and a slide show and its oral presentation. The report, slide show and oral presentation of the policy proposal should include

- new insights on the key problems, what needs to be known and what should be done
- be appealing and persuasive to policy makers and the public
- reflect the expertise of all members of the group

- be based on the concepts introduced in course literature and lectures

#### *Diary on personal deliberation*

During the group work, each participant keeps a written diary (max 2 pages, single spaced, 12 pt Times Roman) containing personal reflections on the group work. The diary should focus on the following questions, with explicit references to course lectures, literature and group work:

Discuss critically the framing issues that took place during the group work. In other words: what was included and what was excluded during the deliberations? More specifically:

- How was the environmental issue under group work framed?
- What was the interplay between facts and values?
- How were the means and ends framed?
- How did power relations between experts become evident in the group work?
- What kinds of expertise were included or excluded during the group work?

#### **Language**

Lectures and student presentation sessions are in Finnish, written course material is mostly in English (some of the case materials are in Finnish).

#### **Literature**

Course reader compiled of articles and book chapters is available on the course web pages.

#### **Prerequisites**

Introduction to Environmental Policy (6 cr), Environmental Policy I (6 cr) and Environmental Policy II are recommended but not required. Familiarity of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process is especially useful, since the group assignment will focus on an example of EIA case study.

## **LECTURE OUTLINE**

(LECTURE 1, 12.3.2014)

### **1. Introduction to environmental policy deliberation**

READ:

FUNTOWICZ, S. and RAVETZ, J., 2003. Post-normal science. *International Society for Ecological Economics (ed.), Online Encyclopedia of Ecological Economics at <http://www.ecoeco.org/publica/encyc.htm>*.

EPSTEIN, S., 1996. *Impure science: AIDS, activism, and the politics of knowledge*. Univ of California Press, p. 1-26.

(LECTURE 2, 19.3.2014)

### **2. Environmental problems as “wicked problems” (framing problems)**

READ:

RITTEL, H.W. and WEBBER, M.M., 1973. Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, **4**(2), pp. 155-169.

LEVIN, K., CASHORE, B., BERNSTEIN, S. and AULD, G., 2012. Overcoming the tragedy of super wicked problems: constraining our future selves to ameliorate global climate change. *Policy Sciences*, **45**(2), pp. 123-152.

(LECTURE 3, 26.3.2014)

### **3. The analytic-deliberative model of decision making (framing rationality)**

READ:

RENN, O., 2008. *Risk Governance. Coping with Uncertainty in a Complex World*. London, UK and Sterling, VA, USA: Earthscan, p. 273-331.

(LECTURE 4, 2.4.2014)

### **4. Environmental policy deliberation as power (framing power)**

READ:

FORESTER, J., 1989. Planning in the face of Power, in *Planning in the Face of Power*. Univ of California Press, p. 27-47.

JASANOFF, S., 2003. Technologies of humility: citizen participation in governing science. *Minerva*, **41**(3), pp. 223-244.

(LECTURE 5, 9.4.2014)

### **5. Introduction to the Joint Fact Finding process (framing environmental deliberation)**

READ:

ANDREWS, C.J., 2002. *Humble analysis: the practice of joint fact-finding*. Greenwood Publishing Group, p. 3-43.

(LECTURE 6, 16.4.2014)

### **6. Methodological issues in JFF and environmental deliberation processes**

READ:

ANDREWS, C.J., 2002. *Humble analysis: the practice of joint fact-finding*. Greenwood Publishing Group, p. 177-186.

RASK, M., 2013. The Tragedy of Citizen Deliberation – Two Cases of Participatory Technology Assessment. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, **25**(1), pp. 39-55.

## **TUTORING SESSIONS**

(SESSION 1, Th 10.4.2014)

**Introduction to group work**

(SESSION 2, Th 17.4.2014)

**Learning and competence building (homogeneous expert groups)**

(SESSION 3, Th 24.4.2014)

**Scoping and problem definition (heterogeneous expert groups)**

(SESSION 4, Th 8.5.2014)

**Negotiation and action recommendation (heterogeneous expert groups)**

(SESSION 5, Th 15.5.2014)

**Reporting: group work presentations**