

# Teaching Unit 11 – Governance for Resilience

## Teacher Instructions

### Activity: Role Playing Municipal Decision-Making on Civic–Public Partnerships

#### 1. Facilitator Instructions

##### Overview

Students simulate a municipal council session evaluating civic proposals and negotiating their integration into local governance. Goal: draft a preliminary Civic–Public Partnership Strategy that balances municipal priorities with community initiatives.

##### Timeline (1 1/2h total)

1. Briefing & Preparation – 10 min
2. Round-table Dialogue – 40 min
3. Consensus Challenge – 20 min
4. Presentations of Outcomes – 10 min
5. Debrief & Reflection – 10 min

##### Materials

- Case description (choose one of the provided cases or write your own)
- Role cards – one per participant/ team
- Printed/ projected maps or GIS/ PPGIS visualizations
- Notepads or shared digital docs for recording agreements
- Timer + whiteboard or digital board for facilitator

##### Ground Rules

- Participants speak in role
- Listen actively and seek balanced trade-offs
- One person speaks at a time
- The facilitator may pause discussion for clarifications

##### Outputs

- 2-page Draft Partnership Strategy summarizing:
  - a. Civic initiative proposals considered
  - b. Governance & accountability mechanisms
  - c. Integration tools (funding, monitoring, spatial planning)
  - d. Monitoring & Accountability (KPIs, periodic review schedule, communication with citizens)
  - e. Risks & Safeguards (identify key risks, state safeguard or mitigation measures)
  - f. Reflection notes from each participant

## 2. Timeline & Process

### 2.1. Briefing & Preparation — 10 minutes

#### **Purpose of this stage**

To frame the simulation as a real municipal decision-making situation, clarify roles, and set non-negotiable constraints. This stage establishes seriousness and prevents the session from drifting into abstract debate.

#### **What the teacher does**

- Introduces the case context clearly and concisely.
- Explains that students are simulating a municipal council decision, not expressing personal opinions.
- Assigns or confirms roles.
- Emphasizes non-negotiables:
  - legal compliance
  - budget realism
  - accountability and public scrutiny

#### **What students do**

- Read the case sheet.
- Receive and internalize their role.
- Clarify their stakeholder's:
  - objectives
  - constraints
  - non-negotiable positions

---

#### **Key message to students**

*"You are not debating ideals. You are designing something that must survive political, legal, and practical reality."*

---

#### **What to watch for**

- Students slipping into personal views instead of role-based reasoning.
- Early moral framing ("the municipality should...").

### 2.2. Round-table Dialogue — 40 minutes

#### **Purpose of this stage**

To surface competing priorities, power asymmetries, and institutional tensions through structured stakeholder interaction.

This is the core learning stage.

#### **What the teacher does**

- Enforces speaking strictly in role.
- Manages time and turn-taking.
- Actively intervenes to keep discussion grounded in governance reality.

**Suggested structure (recommended)**

- Opening statements: each role presents priorities (short, time-limited).
- Negotiation rounds: stakeholders respond, challenge, and adjust positions.
- Spatial or thematic focus: map conflicts, risks, or proposals if tools are available.

**Teacher intervention prompts (use selectively)**

- “Who funds this?”
- “Who is legally responsible?”
- “What happens if this fails?”
- “How is wider public access guaranteed?”

**What students do**

- Advocate for their stakeholder’s position.
- Respond to others’ demands.
- Identify what is negotiable and what is not.
- Begin forming alliances and trade-offs.

**What to watch for**

- Discussion becoming ideological or abstract.
- One stakeholder dominating.
- Avoidance of difficult issues (funding, liability, exclusion).

**2.3. Consensus Challenge — 20 minutes****Purpose of this stage**

To translate dialogue into a concrete governance outcome.

Students must move from discussion to decision-making.

**What the teacher does**

- Signals a shift from debate to production.
- Requires a written Partnership Strategy, not verbal agreement.
- Pushes students toward minimum viable consensus, not perfection.

**Key teacher prompts**

- “What can realistically be approved now?”
- “What needs to be piloted or phased?”
- “Who monitors this, and how?”

**What students do**

- Co-write a **Draft Civic–Public Partnership Strategy**, addressing:
  - proposals accepted or rejected
  - governance mechanisms
  - funding and resources
  - accountability and monitoring
  - risks and safeguards

**What to watch for**

- Vague language (“collaboration”, “dialogue”) without mechanisms.
- Avoidance of responsibility allocation.
- Overly ambitious or unrealistic commitments.

**2.4. Presentations of Outcomes — 10 minutes****Purpose of this stage**

To test clarity, coherence, and legitimacy of the proposed strategy under time pressure.

**What the teacher does**

- Strictly limits time (e.g. 1 slide / 2 minutes).
- Frames feedback around governance quality, not persuasion.

**Suggested feedback criteria**

- Is the proposal institutionally feasible?
- Is it civically legitimate?
- Is the governance structure clear and implementable?

**What students do**

- Present the agreed strategy.
- Defend key decisions briefly.
- Respond to clarifying questions.

**What to watch for**

- Confusion over who decides what.
- Missing accountability mechanisms.
- Overreliance on goodwill rather than structure.

**2.5. Debrief & Reflection — 10 minutes****Purpose of this stage**

To consolidate learning and make power dynamics explicit.

This stage is essential — do not skip it.

**What the teacher does**

Steps students **out of role**.

Facilitates reflection on the process, not just the outcome.

Connects experience to real-world governance.

**Key reflection prompts**

- “Who held the most power, and why?”

- “Which compromises were hardest?”
- “What surprised you about municipal decision-making?”
- “What would you change if this were your city?”

**What students do**

- Reflect individually and collectively.
- Identify moments of tension, frustration, or insight.
- Articulate lessons about participation, power, and realism.

**What to watch for**

- Over-simplified conclusions (“the municipality blocks everything”).
- Missed opportunity to reflect on civic constraints as well.

---

**Final Teacher Note**

This timeline is designed to:

- **Create tension**, not comfort
- **Expose power**, not hide it
- **Produce governance**, not opinions

If the session feels slightly uncomfortable, it is working as intended.

---

### 3. Case description

#### Reactivating the Old Market Square as an Urban Commons Hub

The municipality owns an underused Old Market Square consisting of a covered heritage market hall and an adjacent open plaza. The site experiences heat stress, low activity, and social complaints. A grassroots group (“Market Commons Collective”) proposes a co-managed urban commons model including community markets, cultural programming, repair cafés, and shaded green infrastructure.

The municipality must decide whether and how to integrate this civic initiative while ensuring legal compliance, financial responsibility, political legitimacy, and inclusive access. liance with statutory planning framework. Balance innovation with accountability and risk management.

#### Cooling the City Plaza through Climate-Resilient Commons

The municipality manages a central city plaza that functions as a major pedestrian node between public buildings, retail streets, and public transport stops. Over the past decade, the space has become increasingly hostile during summer months due to extreme heat, lack of shading, and limited vegetation. As a result, pedestrian use has declined, and the plaza is primarily used for transit rather than lingering or social activity.

A coalition of local residents, environmental groups, and young professionals (“Cool City Collective”) proposes transforming the plaza into a climate-resilient urban common. Their proposal includes temporary shading structures, water-sensitive urban design elements, pilot planting zones, and community-led monitoring of microclimatic conditions. The group requests co-decision rights over parts of the design and seasonal programming of the space.

The municipality must decide whether and how to support this initiative while balancing public safety, maintenance obligations, long-term costs, legal responsibility, and equitable access, as well as managing expectations around temporary versus permanent interventions.

#### Adaptive Reuse of a Heritage Building for Community Use

The municipality owns a listed heritage building located at the edge of the historic city centre. The building has remained vacant for several years due to high restoration costs, regulatory constraints, and lack of a clear reuse strategy. While structurally stable, the building requires phased interventions and careful management to comply with heritage protection regulations.

A grassroots cultural association (“Heritage in Use”) proposes an incremental adaptive reuse model, activating parts of the building through low-cost cultural, educational, and social programs. The association seeks a long-term agreement that allows community stewardship, access to certain spaces, and participation in decisions related to programming and gradual upgrades.

The municipality must assess how to integrate this proposal while ensuring heritage compliance, financial sustainability, risk management, transparency in public asset use, and inclusion of wider community interests, beyond the initiating group.

## Case Sheet Template (write your Case Title here)

### Instructions for Teachers: Creating Your Own Case

This template helps you design a TU15 case that generates productive institutional tension between civic initiatives and municipal governance.

#### Step 1 – Choose a Public Asset or Space

Select a municipally owned or managed asset, such as:

- a public square or park
- a heritage building
- a waterfront or industrial site
- a mobility or climate infrastructure space

The asset should have **visible problems** or **underperformance**.

#### Step 2 – Identify a Civic Initiative

Define a **plausible grassroots** or **civic group** that:

- responds to the site's problems
- proposes activation, reuse, or transformation
- seeks some form of recognition, access, or shared governance

Avoid framing the group as purely “heroic” — include limits, dependencies, or internal pressures.

#### Step 3 – Define Municipal Dilemmas

Clearly state **3–5 municipal concerns**, such as:

- legal or regulatory compliance
- funding and long-term maintenance
- political accountability and public scrutiny
- risk, safety, or liability
- inclusivity and fairness

These dilemmas are essential — they drive negotiation.

#### Step 4 – Write the Case (1 short paragraph + 1 decision paragraph)

**Structure to follow:**

##### 1. Context paragraph

Describe the site, its current condition, and why it is problematic.

##### 2. Civic proposal paragraph

Describe what the civic initiative proposes and what it asks from the municipality.

##### 3. Decision paragraph

State that the municipality must decide whether and how to integrate the proposal while balancing competing priorities.

#### Step 5 – Check the Case Quality

Before using the case, ask:

- Does it involve a **real public asset**?
- Are there **no obvious “right” answers**?
- Do multiple stakeholders have **legitimate but conflicting** claims?
- Would a municipal council **realistically argue** over this?

If yes, the case is suitable for TU15.

## 4. Role cards

**A. MUNICIPAL PLANNING OFFICER**

|                           |                                                                                                                  |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Primary Objectives</b> | Ensure compliance with statutory planning framework. Balance innovation with accountability and risk management. |
| <b>Constraints</b>        | Political pressure for quick results. Limited budget, bureaucratic procedures.                                   |
| <b>Negotiable</b>         | Mechanisms of civic inclusion (e.g., advisory councils, co-design workshops).                                    |
| <b>Non-Negotiable</b>     | Legal obligations, transparency requirements.                                                                    |
| <b>Suggested Tactics</b>  | Highlight need for institutional legitimacy. Offer phased pilot programs before scaling.                         |

**B. ELECTED CITY COUNCIL MEMBER**

|                           |                                                                                             |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Primary Objectives</b> | Promote visible, citizen-friendly results. Show responsiveness to local initiatives.        |
| <b>Constraints</b>        | Re-election concerns, media scrutiny.                                                       |
| <b>Negotiable</b>         | Allocation of funds or incentives for civic groups.                                         |
| <b>Non-Negotiable</b>     | Maintaining political credibility.                                                          |
| <b>Suggested Tactics</b>  | Frame decisions as democratic innovation. Seek compromise that maximizes public visibility. |

**C. COMMUNITY INITIATIVE REPRESENTATIVE**

|                           |                                                                                                                     |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Primary Objectives</b> | Secure recognition and support for grassroots projects. Achieve long-term participation rights in governance.       |
| <b>Constraints</b>        | Limited funds, reliance on volunteers.                                                                              |
| <b>Negotiable</b>         | Project scale, co-management models.                                                                                |
| <b>Non-Negotiable</b>     | Autonomy of community governance.                                                                                   |
| <b>Suggested Tactics</b>  | Stress social value, inclusivity, and resilience outcomes. Propose participatory budgeting or co-design mechanisms. |

## D. MUNICIPAL FINANCE OFFICER

|                           |                                                                                              |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Primary Objectives</b> | Ensure fiscal viability of civic-public partnerships. Manage risk and long-term cost.        |
| <b>Constraints</b>        | Budget caps, competing municipal priorities.                                                 |
| <b>Negotiable</b>         | Source of funds (municipal, EU grants, public-private).                                      |
| <b>Non-Negotiable</b>     | Balanced budget compliance.                                                                  |
| <b>Suggested Tactics</b>  | Demand measurable outputs before releasing funds. Encourage co-funding or phased investment. |

## E. URBAN RESILIENCE EXPERT / NGO

|                           |                                                                                                 |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Primary Objectives</b> | Embed resilience, sustainability, and inclusivity. Ensure SDG and NEB principles are addressed. |
| <b>Constraints</b>        | Limited political leverage, need municipal backing.                                             |
| <b>Negotiable</b>         | Scale of interventions.                                                                         |
| <b>Non-Negotiable</b>     | Climate goals, equity principles.                                                               |
| <b>Suggested Tactics</b>  | Provide evidence of resilience co-benefits. Mobilize international frameworks for legitimacy.   |

## F. LOCAL RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

|                           |                                                                                                                |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Primary Objectives</b> | Ensure everyday concerns (affordability, access, livability) are prioritized. Gain a voice in decision-making. |
| <b>Constraints</b>        | Limited institutional knowledge.                                                                               |
| <b>Negotiable</b>         | Project scope, timeline.                                                                                       |
| <b>Non-Negotiable</b>     | Preservation of community identity, transparency of process.                                                   |
| <b>Suggested Tactics</b>  | Use testimonies, petitions, or participatory mapping of needs.                                                 |

## 5. Partnership Strategy Template

- **Shared Vision**  
Shared vision for resilient, inclusive, and accountable civic–public partnership.
- **Civic Initiative Proposals Considered**  
List and evaluate at least 2 community-driven ideas.
- **Governance Mechanisms**  
Advisory board composition, transparency tools, decision rules.
- **Integration Tools**  
Funding sources, participatory budgeting, co-design methods.
- **Monitoring & Accountability**  
KPIs, periodic review schedule, communication with citizens.
- **Risks & Safeguards**  
Identify key risks, briefly state one safeguard or mitigation measure.
- **Reflection**  
Which proposals were easiest/ hardest to integrate? Why?  
How did institutional vs. civic perspectives clash?  
What governance models seemed most viable?  
What lessons can municipalities take to real-world practice?

### Keywords

co-governance, participatory planning, municipal innovation, accountability, civic integration, urban resilience

**TU11 – Civic–Public Partnership Strategy****Case Title:****Stakeholder Roles Represented:****1. Shared Vision** *(3–4 sentences)***2. Civic Initiative Proposals Considered** *(Short bullet points)***3. Governance Mechanisms** *(Concise, concrete description)***4. Integration Tools** *(Bullet points or short paragraph)***5. Monitoring & Accountability** *(Short and specific)*



## Digital Tools Matrix for Stakeholder Dialogue Simulation (optional)

| Stage (Time)                                  | Goal                                                                                                                                  | Suggested Digital Tools                                                                                                                                                                         | Purpose/ How to Use                                                                                                                      |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Quick setup</b><br>(before class – 5 min)  | Preparation of the process and the Digital tools, Assign roles at team members (e.g. timekeeper, scribe, presenter, tool-pilot, etc.) | Tools suggested for a specific task within the different following stages.                                                                                                                      | Be prepared for the Role simulation stages that follow.                                                                                  |
| <b>1. Briefing &amp; Preparation</b> (10 min) | Set context, share roles, capture first impressions                                                                                   | <b>Mentimeter / Slido</b> (live polls)<br><b>Padlet</b> (collaborative wall)<br><b>Canva / Miro template</b> (role cards)                                                                       | Poll students on expectations; collect keywords; visualize stakeholder roles in a clean, shareable format.                               |
| <b>2. Round-table Dialogue</b> (40 min)       | Negotiate, present stakeholder positions, surface conflicts                                                                           | <b>Miro / MURAL</b> (collaborative mapping)<br><b>Kumu.io</b> (network mapping)<br><b>PPGIS / ArcGIS</b><br><b>StoryMaps / Maptionnaire</b> (spatial mapping)<br><b>ChatGPT</b> (civic advisor) | Map arguments visually, trace power dynamics, mark civic vs. municipal claims on maps, ask AI for negotiation prompts or best practices. |
| <b>3. Consensus Challenge</b> (20 min)        | Draft partnership strategy, test alignment                                                                                            | <b>Google Docs / Notion</b> (live drafting)<br><b>Trello / Kanban board</b> (prioritisation)<br><b>Pol.is</b> (real-time consensus polling)<br><b>ChatGPT</b> (policy checker)                  | Co-write draft strategy; rank proposals; check alignment with NEB/SDG frameworks; use AI to spot risks or gaps.                          |
| <b>4. Presentations</b> (10 min)              | Share draft strategies                                                                                                                | <b>Canva / Pitch.com</b> (1-slide pitch)<br><b>Kahoot! / Poll Everywhere</b> (audience feedback)                                                                                                | Make presentations visual; collect instant votes on clarity, feasibility, inclusivity.                                                   |
| <b>5. Debrief &amp; Reflection</b> (10 min)   | Capture lessons learned, blind spots, future steps                                                                                    | <b>Jamboard / Miro sticky notes</b> (reflection board)<br><b>Google Forms exit ticket</b> (structured feedback)<br><b>Mentimeter word cloud</b> (shared insights)                               | Students share what worked/didn't; generate collective word cloud; AI provides "external" critique of final strategies.                  |

# Teaching Unit 13 – Governance for Resilience

## Student Instructions

### 1. What This Session Is About

In this session you will take part in a simulated municipal decision-making process. You will represent a specific stakeholder and negotiate how a civic initiative can be integrated into the governance of a public urban space. The aim is not to ‘win’ the debate, but to co-design a realistic and workable Civic–Public Partnership.

### 2. Your Role as a Participant

- Stay strictly in your assigned role throughout the session.
- Represent your stakeholder’s priorities, constraints, and non-negotiables.
- Listen actively to other roles and seek viable compromises.
- Remember: no stakeholder gets everything they want.

### 3. Session Structure (90 minutes)

#### Stage 1 – Briefing & Framing (10 min)

You receive the case and confirm your role.

#### Stage 2 – Stakeholder Dialogue (40 min)

Stakeholders present positions, negotiate, and map conflicts.

#### Stage 3 – Consensus Challenge (20 min)

You co-write a Partnership Strategy that balances civic and municipal priorities.

#### Stage 4 – Presentations (10 min)

Each group presents the agreed strategy.

#### Stage 5 – Reflection (10 min)

You reflect on power, compromise, and governance.

### 4. What You Are Expected to Produce

- Contribution to a shared Civic–Public Partnership Strategy
- Participation in negotiations and decision-making
- Short individual reflection at the end of the session

### 5. Rules of Engagement

- Speak in role at all times.
- Respect time limits and other speakers.
- Focus on solutions that can realistically be implemented.
- Avoid personal opinions unrelated to your assigned role.

### 6. Reflection Questions (After the Session)

1. Which stakeholder had the most power and why?
2. What compromise was hardest to accept?
3. What would you change if this were implemented in your city?

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>TU11 – Civic–Public Partnership Strategy (<i>Instructions template</i>)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <b>Case Title:</b> <i>(e.g. Old Market Square as an Urban Commons Hub)</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Stakeholder Roles Represented:</b> <i>(List the roles involved in the agreement)</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <p><b>1. Shared Vision</b> <i>(3–4 sentences)</i></p> <p>Briefly describe the <b>shared vision</b> agreed during the simulation.</p> <p>Explain how the proposed partnership aims to balance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• civic initiative and public responsibility</li> <li>• resilience, inclusivity, and accountability</li> </ul> <p>Focus on <b>what the partnership is trying to achieve</b>, not on the process.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| <p><b>2. Civic Initiative Proposals Considered</b> <i>(Short bullet points)</i></p> <p>List <b>at least two community-driven proposals</b> discussed during the dialogue.</p> <p>For each proposal, briefly state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• whether it was accepted, conditionally accepted, or rejected</li> <li>• the main reason for this decision</li> </ul> <p><b>Example format:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal A – Accepted with conditions (reason: funding / risk / inclusivity)</li> <li>• Proposal B – Rejected (reason: legal constraints / lack of accountability)</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>3. Governance Mechanisms</b> <i>(Concise, concrete description)</i></p> <p>Describe <b>how decisions will be made and by whom</b>.</p> <p>Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• composition of any advisory board / committee</li> <li>• role of civic actors vs municipal authorities</li> <li>• basic decision rules (e.g. advisory, co-decision, final municipal approval)</li> <li>• transparency measures (e.g. public reporting, open meetings)</li> </ul> <p>Avoid general terms such as “collaboration” without explaining <b>how it works</b>.</p>                                                         |
| <p><b>4. Integration Tools</b> <i>(Bullet points or short paragraph)</i></p> <p>Explain <b>how the civic initiative is integrated into municipal practice</b>.</p> <p>Possible tools may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• funding sources (municipal budget, grants, co-funding)</li> <li>• participatory budgeting or micro-grants</li> <li>• co-design workshops or pilot programs</li> <li>• temporary permits or phased access to space</li> </ul> <p>Be realistic and proportionate to the scale of the project.</p>                                                                                            |
| <b>5. Monitoring &amp; Accountability</b> <i>(Short and specific)</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

**Describe how the partnership will be monitored and reviewed.**

Include:

- 2–3 key indicators Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) or criteria for success
- frequency of review (e.g. quarterly, annual)
- how results are communicated to citizens
- who is responsible for oversight

This section should show **who is accountable** if things go wrong.

## 6. Risks & Safeguards *(Bullet points)*

Identify **key risks** discussed during the simulation, such as:

- co-optation of civic initiatives
- exclusion of wider community
- financial or operational failure

For each risk, briefly state **one safeguard or mitigation measure**.

**7. Reflection** (*Answer briefly – 2–3 sentences per question*)

- i. Which proposals were easiest or hardest to integrate, and why?
- ii. How did institutional and civic perspectives clash during negotiations?
- iii. Which governance model seemed most viable and realistic?
- iv. What lessons can municipalities take from this case for real-world practice?

UPRUN was cofunded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Erasmus+ National Agency for Higher Education (German Academic Exchange Service). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



This project has received funding under ERASMUS+ Cooperation Partnerships programme. Project No 2023-1-DE01-KA220-HED-000167004.