



**P·A·R·C·C**

**SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY**  
Maxwell School

314.443.2367  
parcc@maxwell.syr.edu

# E-PARCC

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

*Open Electronic Teaching Resources brought to you by the*  
**Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration**

[www.e-parcc.org](http://www.e-parcc.org)

## **The Indiana Household Hazardous Waste Taskforce**

### **TEACHING NOTE**

This teaching note provides a background of the case study, suggested activities, a recommended list of readings, and instructions for linking the case to E-PARCC Teaching Simulation:

“Mapping Network Structure in Complex Community Collaboratives” (Davis & Varda, 2011). This case is best suited for use in a Masters level Public Affairs, Public Policy, or Environmental Policy curriculum. It pairs well with coursework focused on leadership, public management, environmental management, local government, collaborative governance, and network analysis. The case should be assigned as a reading in advance of class discussion (and paired with readings suggested in the final section of this teaching note). The case can be completed in one full standard class session (approximately 3 hours). If completed in conjunction with the optional teaching simulation exercise (discussed later), the case should be completed over two standard class sessions (approximately 6 hours).

#### **I. Background of the Case**

##### ***Purpose of the Case***

The purpose of this case is to demonstrate an example of collaboration and encourage students to identify factors that may contribute to successful collaboration. This is looked at both from a start-up perspective and a sustained-program perspective. Public managers will often find themselves in situations where a network and/or collaboration are called for. In these cases traditional thinking in terms of top-down leadership or program implementation by a single

This case was an honorable mention winner in our 2010-11 “Collaborative Public Management, Collaborative Governance, and Collaborative Problem Solving” teaching case and simulation competition. It was double-blind peer reviewed by a committee of academics and practitioners. It was written by Mark W. Davis and Danielle M. Varda of The School of Public Affairs, University of Colorado at Denver. This case is intended for classroom discussion and is not intended to suggest either effective or ineffective handling of the situation depicted. It is brought to you by E-PARCC, part of the Maxwell School of Syracuse University’s Collaborative Governance Initiative, a subset of the Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration (PARCC). This material may be copied as many times as needed as long as the authors are given full credit for their work.

agency are not appropriate. This case is designed to present a real world example where multiple agencies, in the public sector, not-for-profit sector, and private sector all worked in a cross-sector collaborative fashion and solved a problem that none of them would likely have been able to solve as a single agency. Collaboration studies and network analysis are often framed around the concept of a “wicked problem”. In this case household hazardous waste represents the “wicked problem” at hand. From an analysis perspective it is important to note this case is about a successful collaboration. While most case studies focus on failures, and the lessons that can be learned, this case study instead focused on a series of three program successes.

Specific questions are deliberately not laid out within the case. In this teaching note, we provide a number of options for activities that the instructor may choose to integrate into the class. These include questions, writing exercises, and incorporation of a simulation activity. This case study and teaching note gives an instructor a number of useful tools that will facilitate their students making real world connections between academic course readings and this particular case study.

### ***Summary of the Case***

The case is a historical chronology built around three primary projects completed by the Household Hazardous Waste Task Force. All the events summarized are based on real events in the State of Indiana. All three of the programs outlined in this case are, to date, still fully functional programs carrying out their intended purposes. The three primary projects were:

- The Household Battery Recycling Program, initiated via a grant application completed in 1994;
- The Motor Oil, Oil Filter, and Antifreeze Recycling program, initiated via a grant application completed in 1995; and
- The Mercury Awareness Program (including a collection and recycling component), initiated via a grant application completed in 1998.

The case deliberately does not “name names” but instead presents the information from the perspective of the narrator. If the instructor sees benefit in providing the names of the stakeholders to the students, this information is provided within this teaching note, in the final section, which links this case study to the E-PARCC Teaching Simulation: “Mapping Network Structure in Complex Community Collaboratives” (Davis & Varda, 2011).

## **II. Suggested Activities**

Students should have an opportunity to read the case and the recommended readings before class and come prepared with preliminary thoughts. It is helpful to have students complete the instructor assigned readings from the recommended reading list ahead of the discussion so that the students will be able to place the case within the course’s broader theoretical framework. Case discussion can be completed in approximately one hour, with additional time for small group discussions and/or activities as the instructor sees appropriate.

### ***Pre-Class Student Memos***

To formalize class preparation, the instructor may require students to write a one-page or a two-page memo summarizing the case or dealing with an aspect of the case. These should include specific citations related to readings that speak to the theoretical framework underlying this case.

The memo can focus on a number of topics, for example: illustrating this as an example of government service provision, aspects of public-private partnerships, the balancing of regional efficiency against local autonomy, discussion of how the collaboration began versus how it was fostered and sustained at a 10+ year timeline, discussion of the task force in terms of a network model, and what external factors influenced the success of the task force versus what internal factors influenced its success. *The instructor may also choose to incorporate some of the discussion questions below into the memo assignment.*

### ***Discussion Questions***

Potential discussion questions are broken into three categories: those most appropriate for full class discussion, those most appropriate for small group discussions, and those to be used as preparation for completing the E-PARCC Teaching Simulation: “Mapping Network Structure in Complex Community Collaboratives” (Davis & Varda, 2011). *Additional questions are also paired to particular recommended readings in the suggested readings section of this teaching note.*

### **Full Class Discussion Questions**

1. What factors contributed to the success of this collaborative (both internal and external)?  
*Instructor Hints: Internal factors included the membership’s willingness to collaborate, their early efforts to raise their collective knowledge, a “champion” member willing to provide extra organization assistance and to sponsor contracts/grants, and the initial selection of a relatively easy material to handle (household batteries) and only then once experience was obtained moving on to more challenging materials. External factors: the state grant programs and contractors willing/able to provide the required services.*
2. How did state grant funding affect the process and outcomes of the collaborative?  
*Instructor Hints: Beyond the obvious answer of injecting money toward a solution, the grants also provided a focal point where the membership of the task force were forced to bring their idea together in a coherent and cohesive plan via the grant application.*
3. Discuss the role of the early “champion” in this collaborative? In what ways did the champion enable progress? Could the collaborative have been successful without this champion?  
*Instructor Hints: Aspects of the collaboration, such as the collective education of the membership, were not dependent on the “champion”. Other aspects, such as the initial grant and the contractual processing relationship for the recycling of batteries, the HHWTF were highly dependent on the “champion”. Students should not try to definitely decide whether the task force would have failed or succeeded without the champion, instead they should try to identify points of dependency on the champion and how the HHWTF might have had to proceed if the “champion” had not been a member.*
4. Coordination can be defined as: controlling diverse elements in such a way that they act in an integrated and well-balanced manner. By contrast, collaboration can be defined as: and act of working jointly via a recurrent process where a group of individuals work together toward common goals often via consensus. Is the task force an example of

coordination, collaboration, or both? How are these two terms different from one another?

*Instructor Hints: The short answer to the above question is both. Some network literature discusses that coordination is simply an act of different elements acting in a similar manner. One could interpret this in the context of the task force using the examples of their consistent media campaigns and their consistent service delivery. By contrast, collaboration is much more challenging as it requires a group to reach a consensus toward a common goal or outcome. At its core, the HHWTF is clearly an example of a collaborative. However, perhaps a part of its success is that it was able to take elements of its programs and turn them into a simpler form that only required coordination rather than full-scale collaboration. Students need not reach a definitive answer on the collaboration versus coordination question, instead they should use the case to illuminate a discussion in the academic literature: the contrast between these two definitions.*

5. How can collaborative programs be sustained when demands and needs change over time? What factors play a role in the success of a collaborative program?

*Instructor Hints: Have the students focus on the elements of the HHWTF that move the organization forward from one grant to the next. This should help students to illuminate this question.*

6. What aspects of this collaborative demonstrate an example of a public-private partnership?

*Instructor Hints: The MOOFA grant and the MAP grant included ongoing contractual relationships between the SWMDs and private waste companies able to handle the HHW materials.*

7. What would you see as a next logical step for the HHWTF?

*Instructor Hint: Let the students use their imagination!*

### **Small Group Discussion Questions**

1. In many collaboratives, members agree to participate without funding. This requires a resource commitment from their organization and permission from administrators. What are the factors that motivate organizations to make this commitment?

2. Participants in collaborations contribute their personal resources, (such as time and expertise). What is the motivation for this type of interaction?

*Instructor Hints: For both question 1 and 2 the crux of the discussion is that when an organization or individual is a participant in a collaborative, they must both feel the benefits of membership outweigh the costs of membership.*

3. Leadership is an important factor to successful collaborative governance. Where are examples of leadership within this case? By whom? What impact did these roles have on the process and outcomes of the case?

*Instructor Hints: The IU CUPE member told the group to pick something simple “like batteries”, the narrator plays a key leadership role by becoming the author of the battery*

and MOOFA grants, the “champion” district provides leadership and director for program implementation, etc.

4. How did the role that was played by the narrator affect the outcomes of the collaborative? Could others have played the same role? Do you have any experiences that you can relate to the role the narrator played?

*Instructor Hints: One key point for the students to discuss is that the narrator and the “champion” district were separate entities. The narrator also discusses that the early projects of the task force “felt big”, that is important—allow students to discuss when they too have been involved with a project and felt similarly.*

### **Teaching Simulation “Mapping Network Structure” Preparation Questions**

If the instructor chooses to pair this case study with the E-PARCC Teaching Simulation: “Mapping Network Structure in Complex Community Collaboratives” (Davis & Varda, 2011), these questions can provide an introductory discussion between the case study and the simulation prior to the students formally completing the simulation exercise. The Simulation was an Honorable Mention winner in the 2011 E-PARCC Teaching Simulation competition. This teaching simulation incorporates a similar scenario and stakeholders with a hands-on, in-class activity, making it an ideal companion activity to this case. After reading the simulation and going through the steps, the following questions can be used in a discussion.

1. Who are the stakeholders involved in this collaboration? How did they change between the Battery, MOOFA, and MAP projects?
2. How was the mission of this informal collaboration impacted and changed as the task force entered into contractual relationships with public and private organizations and moved from an informal “name alone” structure to its formal 501(c) 3 not-for-profit corporation status?
3. How did various interests play a role in the development of this collaborative? What kinds of interests might have “threatened” the success of this collaborative?

### **Suggested Readings**

The table below provides a list of suggested course readings and pairs these readings with related study questions.

<b>Suggested Course Reading</b>	<b>Related Study Questions</b>
<p>Agranoff, R. (2003). <i>Leveraging networks: A guide for public managers working across organizations</i>. Washington, DC: IBM Endowment for the Business of Government.</p> <p>McGuire, M. (2006). Collaborative public management: Assessing what we know and how we know it. <i>Public Administration Review</i>, Special Issue, 33-43.</p>	<p>Agranoff and McGuire differentiate four distinct types of networks based on the scope of the network’s activities: informational networks, developmental networks, outreach networks, and action networks. The task force in fact exhibits characteristics of all four of these types of networks. Define each of these terms and discuss how, and at what phases of the task force’s existence, is each type of network most prominent.</p>

<b>Suggested Course Reading</b>	<b>Related Study Questions</b>
Agranoff, R. (2006). Inside collaborative networks: Ten lessons for public managers. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , Special Issue, 56-65.	How does the task force case square with Agranoff's thesis that networks are not replacing traditional bureaucracy but instead the two are successfully co-existing with one another?
Bryon, J. M., B. C. Crosby, & M. M. Stone (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. <i>Public Administration Review</i> , Special Issue, 44-55.	Bryon, Crosby, and Stone discuss how governance crosses different sectors, including government, business, not-for-profits, and the media. Their paper offers a series of propositions regarding collaboration. In reviewing the task force case, which propositions are supported and which are undermined by the history of the task force—support your answer with analysis and citation from the case.
Burt, R. S. (2000). Structural holes versus network closure as social capital. From Eds. N. Lin, K. S. Cook, R. S. Burt, A. de Gruyter <i>Social capital: Theory and research</i> .	In reviewing the task force case, can you identify any key players who filled what Burt would define as “structural holes”?
Huxham, C. & S. Vangen (2005). Coping with trust. In C. Huxham & S. Vangen <i>Managing to Collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage</i> . Routledge, New York, NY.	Trust is a key issue in any collaborative. Huxham and Vangen describe how trust is viewed as both “essential” and “rare” in collaborative settings—at the very same time! Discuss how the Huxham and Vangen trust dichotomy played out in the task force case.
Huxham, C. & S. Vangen (2005). The principles of the theory of collaborative advantage. In C. Huxham & S. Vangen <i>Managing to Collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage</i> . Routledge, New York, NY.	Huxham and Vangen provide “ten tips for collaborating” (p. 37). How applicable or not applicable do you find this list to be for the task force case?
Lin, N. (1999). Building a network theory of social capital. <i>Connections</i> 22(1): 28-51.	Lin's functional-definition of social capital is, “investment in social relationships with expected returns” (p. 30). How is the task force case an example Lin's type of social capital?
Milward, H. B. & K. G. Provan (2000). Governing the hollow state. <i>Journal of Public Administration and Theory</i> . 10(2): 359-379.	How does this article link to the scenario outlined in the Mercury Awareness Program years of the case study? How is the case an example of Milward and Provan's “hollow state”?
Monge, P. R. & N. S. Contractor (2003). Homophily, Proximity, and Social Support Theories. In P. R. Monge N. S. Contractor <i>Theories of Communication Networks</i> , pp 223-240. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.	How does Monge and Contractor's concept of “homophily” play out in the task force case?

Suggested Course Reading	Related Study Questions
<p>Ostrom, V. (1972a). Polycentricity (Part 1). In Editor M. D. McGinnis <i>Polycentricity and local public economies</i> (1999), pp. 52-74. Ann Arbor, MI, USA: University of Michigan Press.</p> <p>Ostrom, V. (1972b). Polycentricity (Part 2). In Editor M. D. McGinnis <i>Polycentricity and local public economies</i> (1999), pp. 119-138. Ann Arbor, MI, USA: University of Michigan Press.</p> <p>Ostrom, V., C. M. Tiebout, &amp; R. Warren (1961). The organization of government in metropolitan areas: A theoretical inquiry. In Editor M. D. McGinnis <i>Polycentricity and local public economies</i> (1999), pp. 31-51. Ann Arbor, MI, USA: University of Michigan Press.</p>	<p>Originally the State of Indiana had hoped for a small number (15 to 20) of geographically large, regionally focused, SWMDs. Instead they ended up with 60+ SWMDs the majority of which were single county districts. Despite this fragmentation, these SWMDs began collaborating on projects, such as the task force outlined in this case. How is this case an example of what Ostrom, Tiebout, and Warren termed a “polycentric” arrangement?</p>
<p>Provan, K. G. &amp; P. Kenis (2007). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. <i>Journal of Public Management Research</i>. Doi: 10.1093/jopart/mum015.</p>	<p>Provan and Kenis discuss three forms of network governance: participant-governed, lead organization-governed, and network administrative organization. The task force in fact exhibits characteristics of all three of these types of network governance; discuss how and at what phases of the task force’s existence is each type most prominent.</p> <p>Provan and Kenis discuss degrees of trust in a network. How does this discussion of trust play out in the task force case?</p>
<p>Provan, K. G. &amp; H. B. Milward (2001). Do networks really work? A framework for evaluating public-sector organizational networks. <i>Public Administration Review</i>, 61(4): 414-423.</p>	<p>How can you measure the “effectiveness” of the task force as a network using Provan and Milward’s criteria?</p> <p>How are Provan and Milward’s levels of analysis (community, network, organization/participant) particular apt for this case study of the task force?</p>
<p>Powell, W. W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy. <i>Research in Organizational Behavior</i>, 12: 295-336.</p>	<p>Powell’s reading helps explain how networks and collaboration are “different” than traditional market or hierarchy approaches. How does this reading tie to the case? Clearly the “task force” is neither market nor hierarchy yet it has membership from private sector entities, not-for-profit entities, and government entities.</p>
<p>Van Bueren, E. M., E. Klijn, &amp; J. F. M. Koppenjan (2003). Dealing with wicked problems in networks: Analyzing an environmental debate from a network perspective. <i>Journal of Public Administration and Theory</i>, 13(2): 193-212.</p>	<p>The term “wicked problems” often comes up in the context of collaboration and network analysis. Define this term, explain how it fits in the context of collaboration, and explain how “household hazardous wastes” fit the “wicked problems” definition.</p>

### III. Linking the Case Study to the Simulation Activity: Mapping Network Structure

If the instructor is placing a focus on network analysis and/or network mapping, the instructor may choose to use this case study in conjunction with the E-PARCC Teaching Simulation: “Mapping Network Structure in Complex Community Collaboratives” (Davis & Varda, 2011). The Simulation was an Honorable Mention winner in the 2011 E-PARCC Teaching Simulation competition and is also available for free download from the E-PARCC website. The case study should be used as an *advanced-level* activity in network mapping *after* the class has completed the easier cases provided with the simulation.

The remaining pages of this teaching note should be provided to students to allow them to complete the network mapping exercise. The first section below provides a list of all stakeholders within the task force over the history of its three grant projects. The second section below provides detailed information on *KEY* stakeholders for the battery grant and is presented in the same format utilized in the E-PARCC Teaching Simulation: “Mapping Network Structure in Complex Community Collaboratives” (Davis & Varda, 2011).

#### *Stakeholders Over The History of the HHWTF*

Below is a list of the SWMD members at various points in the existence of the task force. Most of these districts were small rural counties. In the section related to pairing the case study with the **Linking to Simulation Activity: Mapping Network Structure** “Mapping Network Structure” teaching simulation, additional details are provided regarding key player members of the task force.

#### The Original HHWTF Membership

The *original* Rural Household Hazardous Waste Task Force consisted of the solid waste management districts from these 12 Indiana counties: Brown, Daviess, Dubois, Greene, Jackson, Knox, Lawrence, Martin, Monroe, Spencer, Pike, and Posey. *The narrator was from the Brown County Solid Waste Management District.* In addition there was a representative from the Indiana University Center for Urban Policy and Environmental and a representative from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management regularly in attendance.

#### The “Battery Grant” HHWTF Membership

The membership of the Rural Household Hazardous Waste Task Force at the time the “Battery Grant” was submitted consisted of the solid waste management districts from 17 Southwest Indiana counties. The single-county SWMDs included: Brown, Daviess, Dubois, Gibson, Greene, Jackson, Knox, Lawrence, Martin, Monroe, Spencer, Pike, Posey, and Vanderburgh. The three-county Clay-Owen-Vigo multicounty SWMD was also a member. The Brown County SWMD Director was the author of the grant. The Monroe County SWMD Hazardous Materials Coordinator oversaw the regional collection hub. The representative from the Indiana University Center for Urban Policy and Environmental formally became the final grant report author and the representative from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management formally became the grant administrator.



## The “MOOFA” HHWTF Membership

The membership of the Regional Household Hazardous Waste Task Force at the time the “Motor Oil, Oil Filter, and Antifreeze Grant” was submitted consisted of the solid waste management districts from 25 Southern Indiana counties. The single-county SWMDs included: Brown, Daviess, Dubois, Gibson, Greene, Jackson, Johnson, Knox, Lawrence, Martin, Monroe, Pike, Posey, Spencer, and Vanderburgh. The three-county Clay-Owen-Vigo multicounty SWMD and the seven-county Southeastern Indiana multiple county SWMD were also members. The Brown County SWMD Director was the author of the grant. The Monroe County SWMD Hazardous Materials Coordinator assisted in grant writing, oversaw grant administration, and oversaw contracting with private companies. During the MOOFA grant the representative from the Indiana University Center for Urban Policy and Environmental accepted a new position and the Center ceased its formal relationship with the task force. The representative from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management continued as the grant administrator.

## MAP and the HHWTF

While levels of participation varied, all Indiana Counties participated in the Mercury Awareness Program in one form or another. The key additional player was the addition of the Mercury Awareness Program Coordinator.

### ***KEY Stakeholders for the HHWTF’s Battery Recycling Grant***

The materials presented below will allow students to complete the E-PARCC Teaching Simulation: “Mapping Network Structure in Complex Community Collaboratives” (Davis & Varda, 2011).

**Who Are the Stakeholders?** - A group of 17 adjoining solid waste management districts in Southern Indiana have been awarded a grant by the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) to develop a regional cooperative household battery recycling program. IDEM has assigned a representative from their agency to act as the grant administrator. These districts have enlisted the assistance of four key players: (1) the Monroe County Solid Waste Management District is both the administrator of the grant and the “collection hub” for the batteries collected; (2) Indiana University’s Center for Urban Policy and the Environment will be writing the final grant report for the project; (3) Per the grant, the task force has hired an advertising firm to develop their education and media campaign for the program; and (4) the Director of the Brown County Solid Waste Management District (as the author of the successful grant application) has been appointed the “chairman” of the task force. Additionally, the Monroe County Solid Waste Management District has contracted with a private waste collection company to process and recycling the batteries collected and consolidated in Monroe County.

The table below provides further information on all of these key stakeholders in the task force. In the first column, the formal name of each player is listed. The second column lists the assets each player brings to the collaboration, their existing relationships, and their vision for the coalition. The third column details each player’s interest in participating in the task force. The final column identifies the network connections that each player has to others. Read through the table below. Using the information provided put together a visual of the Household Hazardous

Waste Task Force’s network for the collaborative battery recycling grant. Use the “Connections” column to identify who is connected to whom.

### Introducing the Stakeholder

Key Stakeholder	Assets / Relationships / Network Vision	Interests	Connections
<b>Although there are a total of 17 solid waste management districts participating in this collaboration, DO NOT attempt to map all these members. Instead map the KEY STAKEHOLDERS listed below.</b>			
Monroe County Solid Waste Management District (SWMD) (a local government agency)	Solid source of tax-based funding, three years experience operating a household hazardous waste collection facility, and an existing relationship with the private waste hauler. Monroe will be the “collection hub” for the battery recycling program. <i>Monroe County SWMD envisions itself as the center of the network.</i>	Providing services to surrounds SWMDs to fund further growth of their own program. Wants to be viewed as a leader, innovator, and a key central node.	Brown; Private Waste Hauler; IDEM; IU CUPE; Ad Firm
Brown County Solid Waste Management District (SWMD) (a local government agency)	Author of the battery grant and now chairman of the task force. Existing cooperative HHW program via an interlocal governmental agreement with Monroe Co SWMD. This has worked successfully for two years. Beyond this, limited funding and limited staff time. <i>Brown envisions the task force capable of numerous cooperative programs beyond just batteries. Brown further envisions a similar interlocal cooperative could work successfully between Monroe and other SWMDs.</i>	Globally: Providing vision for the HHWTF.  Locally: Delivering HHW services at the lowest cost possible.	Monroe; IDEM; IU CUPE; Ad Firm
Private Waste Collection Company (a private company)	A dedicated staff member for HHW services, significant access to knowledge in the area, clearly “seeking business” for firm. <i>Their only connection to the network is via their contractual relationship with Monroe.</i>	Business opportunity.	Monroe
Indiana University: Center for Urban Policy and the Environment (an academic “think tank”)	A representative from IU CUPE has participated in the HHWTF since its inception. They have always been valued for their independent counsel. <i>Via their grant their relationship has been formalized in that they will write the final grant report. However, this decision was made based upon IU CUPE’s independent relationship with the task force.</i>	Academic research with real world applications.	Brown; Monroe; IDEM
Indiana Department of Environmental Management (a state agency)	A representative from IDEM has participated in the HHWTF since its inception. They have always been valued for their independent counsel. <i>Via their grant their relationship has been formalized. The HHWTF is now in a contractual and monetary relationship with IDEM and the IDEM representative is now formally the grant’s administrator.</i>	Grant funding toward a successful regional program.	Brown; Monroe; IU CUPE

<b>Key Stakeholder</b>	<b>Assets / Relationships / Network Vision</b>	<b>Interests</b>	<b>Connections</b>
Ad Firm (a private company)	A staff member is developing the ad campaign / education campaign for the task force. The firm is clearly “seeking business” but is willing to help. <i>While their formal connection to the network is via their contractual relationship with Monroe, the ad firm works with Brown as the task force chairman and regularly attends the month HHWTF meetings.</i>	Business opportunity.	Brown; Monroe