

EMGT 764: RECOVERY THEORY AND PRACTICE

Fall 2012

T/TH 11:00a.m.-12:15p.m.

Room: Morrill Hall 105

Credits: 3

Instructor: Jessica Jensen

Phone: 231-5762(o) or 219-4293(c)

Email: EMAIL THROUGH BLACKBOARD

Office: 102C Putnam

Office Hours: Tuesday and Thursday from 8:30a.m. to 10:00a.m. and by appointment

Course Bulletin Description

Theory, principles, and procedures used in disaster damage assessment and in emergency supply and service dissemination.

Course Goal

The purpose of this course is to explore the definition, varying scope, tasks associated with and process of recovery as well as how recovery progress might be assessed through reading, writing, discussion, and research.

Course Objectives

By the end of this course, students will be able to

- Discuss the responsibilities, perspectives, and priorities of various stakeholder groups during recovery;
- Identify and explain the various tasks associated with recovery for each stakeholder group;
- Identify resources available to stakeholder group in the aftermath of hazard events;
- Identify and explain the factors research suggests are related to overall community recovery;
- Discuss the factors research suggests are related to expedient and full recovery of various stakeholder groups;
- Define and discuss the relationship between recovery, sustainability, and resilience.

Course Expectations

1. Grading:

The instructor will make every effort to provide grades for each assignment within two weeks of the assignment's due date. Grades, when provided, will be just that—a point value and letter grade. Explanation of the grade earned will be communicated in person through face-to-face interaction with the course instructor at the participant's request. The instructor

encourages students to visit about grades earned throughout the course. Moreover, the instructor highly recommends that course participant's visit with the course instructor to review their ideas for their assignments and/or drafts of their assignments before they are submitted. Feedback is always provided by the instructor; and, this feedback can be very helpful in supporting efforts to earn desired grades.

2. Attendance:

According to [NDSU Policy 333](#), attendance in classes is expected. Only the course instructor can excuse a participant from course responsibilities. (The term "*course*" includes class, laboratory, field trips, group exercises, and or other activities.) Participants are expected to attend every class. If a participant will miss a class, it is the participant's responsibility to inform the instructor.

3. Behavior:

Participants are expected to exhibit courtesy to the instructor and to other participants during class time by not engaging in disruptive behavior (e.g., talking/whispering when the instructor or another participant is speaking, answering their cell phone, *texting*, *using their laptop computers to surf the internet or check email*). Participants engaging in behavior determined inappropriate by the instructor will be warned once. At the second incident, the participant will be asked to leave the classroom for the remainder of the class period. A third incident will result in consultation with the Head of the Department of Emergency Management to initiate cancellation of the participant's registration in the course.

4. Diversity:

This course, like North Dakota State University, seeks to create an environment where equal opportunity is guaranteed and diversity is welcomed, respected, and appreciated for all individuals without regard to age, color, disability, gender identity, marital status, national origin, public assistance status, sex, sexual orientation, status as a U.S. veteran, race, religion, or participation in lawful activity off the employer's premises during nonworking hours which is not in direct conflict with the essential business-related interests of the employer. In addition to the aforementioned individual characteristics that represent aspects of diversity, participants in the course may also observe diversity in thinking, opinion, beliefs, and argument in our course. Participants in this course are expected to welcome, respect, and appreciate diversity as well as seek opportunities to learn from diversity as it manifests itself in our course.

5. Academic Honesty:

The academic community is operated on the basis of honesty, integrity, and fair play. NDSU Policy 335: Code of Academic Responsibility and Conduct applies to cases in which cheating, plagiarism, or other academic misconduct have occurred in an instructional context. Participants found guilty of academic misconduct are subject to penalties, up to and possibly including suspension and/or expulsion. Participant academic misconduct records are maintained by the Office of Registration and Records. Informational resources about academic honesty for participants and instructional staff members can be found at www.ndsu.edu/academichonesty.

6. Special Needs:

Any participants with disabilities or other special needs, who need special accommodations in this course are invited to share these concerns or requests with the instructor as soon as possible.

Assignments

Reading Assignments

There will be several lengthy reading assignments associated with most weeks in the course. It will be critical to your success in the course that you keep up with these assignments. Please see the required readings below for details about the required texts for the course; and, please see the tentative course schedule for specific reading assignments associated with each week of the course.

Each course participant is expected to complete all of the assigned readings listed in the tentative course schedule for most week; however, weeks accompanied by the phrases “ALL READ” and “*DIVIDED READINGS*” indicate that there are some readings all course participants must do and some that will be divided amongst participant’s (e.g., If there were 12 listed readings, then each participant might read only 4 in addition to the 1 or 2 designated ALL READ.).

Note: The readings may change. New reading assignments may be added; new reading assignments may be substituted for current reading assignments listed; or, reading assignments may be no longer required.

Required Readings:

1. Alesch, D., Arendt, L., & Holly, J. (2009). *Managing for long-term community recovery in the aftermath of disaster*. Fairfax, VA: Public Entity Risk Institute.
2. Phillips, B. (2009). *Disaster recovery*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
3. Smith, G. (2011). *Planning for post-disaster recovery: A review of the United States disaster assistance framework*. Fairfax, VA: Public Entity Risk Institute.
4. Other materials as assigned. Available on Blackboard or through the library.

On-the-spot Responses (10 points each, approximately 60 points total)

Participants will take part in approximately six on-the-spot responses to questions requiring participants to demonstrate their knowledge, comprehension, and/or ability to apply what they have learned in through class lecture*. The questions or prompts will not be designed to stump, confuse, or embarrass participants. For instance, following a lecture early in the semester a possible on-the-spot response question might ask the participant to identify the 4 primary theoretical frameworks used in recovery, the definition for recovery and its goal, or the evolution of the body of knowledge related to recovery.

Most of the on-the-spot responses will be delivered orally; some may be in writing. Responses are NOT expected to be long! If giving an oral response, one can expect a 1 minute response to be sufficient to answer the question. If delivering a written response, one can expect a one paragraph response of 3-5 sentences should be sufficient to answer the question. Evaluation of responses will be based on two criteria:

- 1) *Accuracy*—Was what was stated consistent with lecture? Worth up to 5 points.
- 2) *Thoroughness*—Was something significant omitted from lecture? Worth up to 5 points.

NOTE: The instructor may substitute a short assignment in lieu of one or more of the in-class on-the-spot responses. Course participants will have at least 3 days to complete any short assignments given. Examples of conditions under which short assignments may be provided include when the course instructor cancels class due to travel or when there are divided reading assignments.

Anticipating Recovery Progress Essay: Part One (75 points)

Course participants will write an argumentative paper that suggests what factors may be assessed the moment a disaster occurs to allow a community (broadly defined) to anticipate how recovery will progress. For example, if a tornado completed its pass through North Fargo, ND at 10p.m. on July 23, 2012, what could be assessed at 10:01p.m. to anticipate how recovery will proceed? You need to argue what factors may be assessed. The factors suggested **MUST BE BASED ON THE ACADEMIC LITERATURE!**

You do not need to suggest actual measures for the factors you introduce. How the factors would be actually assessed may be through qualitative or quantitative means and assessment of the factors may involve the quick collection of data or be based purely on the perception of the assessor. These issues should not be the focus of the essay.

There is no minimum or maximum length for the essays. It is not expected that a well-crafted essay would require more than 7 pages of text. Essays should be double-spaced, in 12 point font, with 1 inch margins on all sides, and all references should be in APA format. How the assignment will be evaluated will be discussed in class. A paper copy of it must be submitted on the due date identified in the course syllabus and an electronic copy must be submitted via email on the same day you submit your paper copy.

Recovery Progress Research Project

Course participants will engage in an individual research project on short-term recovery progress in United States locations that received a Presidential Disaster Declaration (PDD) for flooding in 2011. Course participants will be challenged to collect 50+ news stories on a flood event's aftermath, conduct content analysis on the news stories, and develop a case study paper based on their content analysis. Exactly how content analysis will be conducted will be discussed in class after course participants review content analysis methods chapters provided by the instructor. Each course participant will be conducting content analysis based on the same categories/criteria.

In an attempt to bring about project success, there will be five assignments due throughout the semester leading up to the due date of the final case study paper. Specifically, course participants will have to submit the following to the course instructor:

1. *Content Analysis Categories/Criteria Suggestions* (10 points)—Following your review of the content analysis methods chapters provided by the course instructor, suggestion of the categories and criteria for analysis in a typed 1-2 page document. More information about

this particular assignment will be provided in class. If the assignment demonstrates an awareness of content analysis and course participant effort to think about the project, then full points will be awarded.

2. *Disaster Information* (10 points)—The specific flood location you have chosen from the events on the list; the dates of the event; the date a PDD was declared; the types of federal assistance available; counties covered under the PDD; the primary news outlets (as far as you can tell) for your disaster location. If the assignment is completed accurately in keeping with the described criteria, full points will be earned.
3. *News Stories File* (10 points)—An electronic file with more than 50 news stories related to dealing with the flood's aftermath that were published within 180 days of the event. The news stories may be from newspapers or television news stations BUT they must be from LOCAL NEWS MEDIA. News stories do not include editorials, opinion pieces, or blog entries. The articles must be copied and pasted into individually named word documents. The word documents must be named in the following format "MonthDayYear of publication.Story title.Story source". For example, "121611.No building for one year.Minot Daily News". If the assignment is submitted with more than 50 articles that meet the described criteria, then full points will be earned.
4. *Completed Excel File* (25 points)—After the class comes to consensus as to what categories and criteria will be used in content analysis, the instructor will develop an excel file for everyone to enter the data from the news stories. The instructor will review how to use the excel file in class. Following these steps, course participants will complete the content analysis process using the file. The completed excel file must be submitted to the course instructor via email. If the assignment has been completed for all articles submitted and a spot check of 3-5 articles by the course instructor reveals that content analysis was completed well, then full points will be earned.
5. *Outline* (25 points)—An "outline" for the case study that identifies the major sections of the paper, major points to be addressed within the findings sections, and major points to be made in the discussion section must be submitted. The formal headers for the project need to be evidenced on what is submitted with some text beneath each header BUT, complete sentences and paragraphs are NOT required. If the assignment meets these criteria, shows effort, and makes sense given the excel file submitted, then the maximum points will be earned.
6. *Case Study* (100 points)—There is no minimum or maximum length for the final case studies submitted. It is not expected that a well-crafted paper would require more than 15 pages of text. Case studies should be double-spaced, in 12 point font, with 1 inch margins on all sides, employ headers (including introduction, background, discussion, and conclusion and others based on the categories used for content analysis), tables (if used) should be in a consistent format and be placed after the references section, and all references should be in APA format. How the assignment will be evaluated will be discussed in class. An electronic copy of the assignment must be submitted before class via email on the assignment's due date AND a paper copy of the assignment must be

submitted in class. The due date for the assignment is identified in the tentative course schedule in this syllabus.

NOTE: The course instructor will be using the data collected (i.e., news stories) by course participants to conduct content analysis across all of the stories for eventual publication in a scholarly, peer-reviewed journal. The instructor may invite one or more students to participate in the follow-on research project. If invited to participate, there is no obligation for anyone to participate.

Assessing Recovery Progress Essay: Part Two (100 points)

Each course participant will write an essay suggesting what is relevant for assessing recovery progress at the community level (broadly defined) after a disaster has occurred. The factors **MUST BE BASED ON THE ACADEMIC LITERATURE!**

You do not need to suggest actual measures for the factors you introduce. How the factors would be actually assessed may be through qualitative or quantitative means and assessment of the factors may involve the quick collection of data or be based purely on the perception of the assessor. These issues should not be the focus of the essay.

There is no minimum or maximum length for the essays. It is not expected that a well-crafted essay would require more than 10 pages of text. Essays should be double-spaced, in 12 point font, with 1 inch margins on all sides, and all references should be in APA format. How the assignment will be evaluated will be discussed in class. A paper copy of it must be submitted on the due date identified in the course syllabus and an electronic copy must be submitted via email on the same day you submit your paper copy.

Presentation (20 points)

Course participants will give an informal presentation that compares what the literature says is relevant with what the media focused on in the news stories from your case study; and, the implications of this comparison for the practice of emergency management. Your presentation should last no longer than 5 minutes. The purpose of the presentations is to set the stage for a final class discussion regarding assessing the progress of recovery at the community level (broadly defined). If the course participant provides an articulate review of the findings from their case study and demonstrates thoughtful analysis of how their study findings link to the academic literature, full points will be earned.

Tentative Course Schedule

Date	Topic	Assignments
MODULE ONE: COURSE INTRODUCTION		
Week One: August 20-24		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course Introduction • Theoretical Framework and Definitions 	Assignment(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
	Reading(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alesch, D., Arendt, L., & Holly, J. (2009). Chapter 1. In <i>Managing for long-term community recovery in the aftermath of disaster</i> (pp. X-X). Fairfax, VA: Public Entity Risk Institute. • Rubin, C. (2009). Long-term recovery from disasters: The neglected component of emergency management. <i>Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management</i>, 6(1), Article 46.
Week Two: August 27-31		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overarching Recovery Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation, Sustainability, Resilience • General Factors Influencing Recovery 	Assignment(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
	Reading(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Berke, P. Kartez, J., & Wenger, D. (1993). Recovery after disaster: Achieving sustainable development, mitigation, and equity. <i>Disasters</i>, 17, 93-109. • Cutter, S., Burton, C., & Emrich, C. (2010). <i>Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management</i>, 7(1), Article 51. • Norris, F., Stevens, S., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K., & Pfefferbaum, R. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. <i>American Journal of Community Psychology</i>, 41, 127-150. • Passerini, E. (2000). Disasters as agents of change in recovery and reconstruction. <i>Natural Hazards Review</i>, 1(2), 67-72. • Reddy, S. (2000). Factors influencing the incorporation of hazard mitigation during recovery from disaster. <i>Natural Hazards</i>, 22, 185-201. • Vale, L., & Campanella, T. (2005). Axioms of resilience. In L. Vale and T. Campanella (eds), <i>The resilient city: How modern cities recover from disaster</i> (pp. 335-353). New York: Oxford University Press.
MODULE TWO: STAKEHOLDER GROUPS AS RECOVERY SURIVORS AND PARTICIPANTS		
Week Three: September 3-7— NO SCHOOL ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 3		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nongovernmental Organizations in Recovery 	Assignment(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content Analysis Categories/Criteria Suggestions, due September 8

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As Impacted Organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts • Sources of Aid • F/I Factors • As Participants in Community Recovery • Assessing Progress 	<p><i>ALL READ:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brudney, J., & Gazley, B. (2009). Planning to be prepared: An empirical examination of the role of voluntary organizations in county government emergency planning. <i>Public Performance & Management Review</i>, 32(3), 372-399. • Smith, G. A (2011). Nonprofit relief organizations. In G. Smith, <i>Planning for post-disaster recovery: A review of the United States disaster assistance framework</i> (pp. 127-156). Fairfax, VA: Public Entity Risk Institute. <p><i>DIVIDED READINGS:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bolin, R., & Stanford, L. (1998). The Northridge Earthquake: Community-based approaches to unmet recovery needs. <i>Disasters</i>, 22(1), 21-38. • Boris, E., & Steuerle, C.E. (2006). After Katrina: Public expectation and charities' response. The Urban Institute. • Chandra, A., & Acosta, J. (2009). The role of nongovernmental organizations in long-term human recovery after disaster. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation. • Kapucu, N. (2003). Coordinating without hierarchy: Public – non-profit partnerships. Paper presented at The International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration Conference, 14-18 September 2003, Miami (USA). • Phillips & Jenkins (2008). The roles of faith-based organizations after Hurricane Katrina. In R. Kilmer, V. Gil-Rivas, R. Tedeschi, and L. Calhoun (eds), <i>Helping families and communities recover from disaster: Lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath</i> (pp. x-x). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. • Pipa, T. (2006). Weathering the storm: The role of local nonprofits in the Hurricane Katrina relief effort. North Carolina: The Aspen Institute and The Nonprofit Sector Research Fund Working Paper Series.
<p>Week Four: September 10-14</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue NGOs in Recovery • Begin Businesses in Recovery 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disaster Information, due September 13 <p><i>ALL READ:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phillips, B. (2009). Chapter 8: Business recovery. In B. Phillips, <i>Disaster recovery</i> (pp. 231-262). New York: Taylor & Francis. • Smith, G. A (2011). The private sector and for-profit organizations. In G. Smith, <i>Planning for post-disaster recovery: A review of the United States disaster assistance framework</i> (pp. 157-191). Fairfax, VA: Public Entity Risk Institute.
<p>Week Five: September 17-21</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Businesses In Recovery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As Impacted Organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts • Sources of Aid • F/I Factors • As Participants in 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • News Stories File, due September 20 <p>Reading(s):</p> <p><i>DIVIDED READINGS:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chamlee-Wright, E., & Storr, V. (2008). <i>The entrepreneur's role in post-disaster community recovery: Implications for post-disaster recovery policy</i>. Fairfax, VA: Mercatus Center, George Mason University.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Recovery • Assessing Progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corey, C., & Deitch, E. (2011). Factors affecting business recovery immediately after Hurricane Katrina. <i>Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management</i>, 19(3), 169-181. • Furlong, S., & Scheberle, D. (1998). Gaps between norms of disaster agencies and expectations of small businesses. <i>American Review of Public Administration</i>, 28(4), 267-389. • Haynes, G., Danes, S., & Stafford, K. (2011). Influence of federal disaster assistance on family business survival and success. <i>Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management</i>, 19(2), 86-98. • Pearson, M., Hickman, T., & Lawrence, K. (2011). Retail recovery from natural disasters: New Orleans versus eight other United States disaster sites. <i>The International Review of Retail, Distribution, and Consumer Research</i>, 21(5), 415-444. • Runyan, R. (2006). Small business in the face of crisis: Identifying barriers to recovery from a natural disaster. <i>Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management</i>, 14(1), 12-26. • Webb, G., Tierney, K., & Dahlhamer, J. (2002). Predicting long-term business recovery from disaster: A comparison of the Loma Prieta earthquake and Hurricane Andrew. <i>Environmental Hazards</i>, 4, 45-58.
Week Six: September 24-28	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals and Households In Recovery • As Survivors • Impacts 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <p>Reading(s):</p> <p>ALL READ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bolin, R., & Trainer, P. (1978). Modes of family recovery following disaster: A cross-national study. In E. L. Quarantelli (ed.), <i>Disasters: Theory and research</i> (pp. 234-247). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. • Norris, F., Friedman, M., Watson, P., Byrne, C., Diaz, E., & Kaniasty, K. (2002). 60,000 disaster victims speak?: Part I. An empirical review of the empirical literature, 1981-2001. <i>Psychiatry</i>, 65(3), 207-239. • Phillips, B. (2009). Social psychological recovery. In B. Phillips, <i>Disaster recovery</i> (pp. 291-332). New York: Taylor & Francis. <p>BEGIN NEXT WEEK'S DIVIDED READINGS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</p>
Week Seven: October 1-5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals and Households In Recovery Continued • As Survivors • Sources of Aid • F/I Factors 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <p>Reading(s):</p> <p>DIVIDED READINGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airriess, C., Li, W., Leong, K., Chen, A., & Keith, V. (2008). Church-based social capital, networks and geographic scale: Katrina evacuation, relocation, and recovery in a New Orleans Vietnamese American community. <i>Geoforum</i>, 39, 1333-1346. • Beggs, J., Haines, V., & Hulbert, J. (1996). The effects of personal network and local community contexts on the receipt of formal aid during disaster recovery. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 14(1), 57-78. • Cherry, A., & Cherry, M. (1997). A middle class response to disaster: FEMA's policies and problems. <i>Journal of Social Service Research</i>,

	<p>23(1), 71-87.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dash, N., Morrow, B., Mainster, J., & Cunningham, L. (2007). Lasting effects of Hurricane Andrew on a working-class community. <i>Natural Hazards Review</i>, 8(1), 13-21. • Finch, C., Emrich, C., & Cutter, S. (2010). Disaster disparities and differential recovery in New Orleans. <i>Population and Environment</i>, 31, 179-202. • Forgette, R., Dettrey, B., Van Boening, M., & Swanson, D. (2009). Before, now, and after: Assessing Hurricane Katrina relief. <i>Population Research and Policy Review</i>, 28, 31-44. • Hori, M., & Schafer, M. (2010). Social costs of displacement in Louisiana after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. <i>Population and Environment</i>, 31, 64-86. • Kamel, N., & Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (2004). Residential assistance and recovery following the Northridge Earthquake. <i>Urban Studies</i>, 41(3), 533-562. • Ibanez, G., Khatchikian, N., Buck, C., Weisshaar, D., Abush-Kirsh, T, Lavizzo, E., & Norris, F. (2003). Qualitative analysis of social support and conflict among Mexican and Mexican-American disaster survivors. <i>Journal of Community Psychology</i>, 31(1), 1-23. • McDonnell, S., Troiano, R., Barker, N., Noji, E., Hlady, W., & Hopkins, R. (1995). Evaluation of long-term community recovery from Hurricane Andrew: Sources of assistance received by population sub-groups. <i>Disasters</i>, 19(4), 338-348. • Zakour, M., & Harrell, E. (2003). Access to disaster services. <i>Journal of Social Service Research</i>, 30(2), 27-54.
--	---

Week Eight: October 8-12

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals and Households In Recovery Continued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As Participants in Community Recovery • Assessing Recovery Progress for I/H 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <p>Reading(s):</p> <p><i>ALL READ:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abramson, D., Stehling-Ariza, T., Park, Y., Walsh, L., & Culp, D. (2010). Measuring individual disaster recovery: A socioecological framework. <i>Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness</i>, 4(Supplement 1), S46-S54. • Smith, G. A (2011). Individuals and emergent groups. In G. Smith, <i>Planning for post-disaster recovery: A review of the United States disaster assistance framework</i> (pp. 239-260). Fairfax, VA: Public Entity Risk Institute. <p><i>DIVIDED READINGS:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chamlee-Wright, E., & Storr, V. (2009). <i>Filling the civil-society vacuum: Post-disaster policy and community response</i>. Policy Comment No. 22. Fairfax, VA: Mercatus Center, George Mason University • Johnson, D., Becker, J., & Paton, D. Multiagency community engagement during disaster recovery: Lessons from two New Zealand earthquake events. <i>Disaster Prevention and Management</i>, 21(2), 252-268. • Kweit, M. & Kweit, R. (2004). Citizen participation and citizen evaluation in disaster recovery. <i>American Review of Public Administration</i>, 34(4), 354-373.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolensky, R. (1983). Power structure and group mobilization following disaster: A case study. <i>Social Science Quarterly</i>, 64(1) 97-110.
MODULE THREE: GOVERNMENT IN RECOVERY	
Week Nine: October 15-19	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State and Federal Government in Recovery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles • Structures suggested • Programs offered 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed Excel File, due October 18 <p>Reading(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burns, P., & Thomas, M. A new New Orleans? Understanding the role of history and the state-local relationship in the recovery process. <i>Journal of Urban Affairs</i>, 30(3), 259-271. • Liu, A. (2010). <i>Federal post-disaster recovery: A review of programs</i>. Washington, DC: Metropolitan Policy Program and the Brookings Institute. • Smith, G. A (2011). The public sector: Federal, state, and local governments. In G. Smith, <i>Planning for post-disaster recovery: A review of the United States disaster assistance framework</i> (pp. 35-72). Fairfax, VA: Public Entity Risk Institute. • Sylves, R. (2008). Understanding disaster policy through presidential disaster declarations. In R. Sylves, <i>Emergency management and homeland security disaster policy and politics</i> (pp. 76-107). Washington, DC: CQ Press.
Week Ten: October 22-26	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Level Government in Recovery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts • Sources of Aid • Restoration of Community Services 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessing Recovery Progress Essay Part One, due October 25 (bring paper to class on October 30) <p>Reading (s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alesch, D., Arendt, L., & Holly, J. (2009). Chapter 4: Recovery: Beyond restoring the built environment, Chapter 5: Forces that complicate community recovery, Chapter 6: Often local economy unravels, Chapter 7: Post-event demographic changes, Chapter 8: Housing and rebuilding issues, Chapter 10: Local government workload and employee stress, Chapter 11: A diminished revenue base, Chapter 12: Skyrocketing expenses, cash shortages, and closing the revenue gap.. In <i>Managing for long-term community recovery in the aftermath of disaster</i>. Fairfax, VA: Public Entity Risk Institute. • Sundet, P., & Mermelstein, J. (1996). Predictors of rural community survival after natural disaster: Implications for social work practice. <i>Journal of Social Service Research</i>, 22(1/2), 57-70. • Wolensky, R., & Miller, E. (1981). The everyday and disaster role of local officials: Citizen and official definitions. <i>Urban Affairs Quarterly</i>, 16(4), 483-504.
MODULE FOUR: KEY RECOVERY TASKS	
Week Eleven: October 29-November 2	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recovery Tasks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage Assessment 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <p>Reading(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cochrane, H. A preliminary analysis of damages and economic dislocations. In R. Bolin (ed), <i>The Loma Prieta Earthquake: Studies of short-term impacts</i> (pp. 25-32). Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, Institute of Behavioral Science, Program on Environment and Behavior. • French, S. A preliminary assessment of damage to urban infrastructure. In R. Bolin (ed), <i>The Loma Prieta Earthquake: Studies of short-term impacts</i> (pp. 17-24). Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, Institute of Behavioral Science, Program on Environment and Behavior. • McEntire, D., Souza, J., Collins, M., Peters, E., and Sadiq, A. (2012). An introspective glance into damage assessment: Challenges and lessons learned from the Paso Robles (San Simeon) earthquake. <i>Natural Hazards</i>, 61(3), 1389-1409. • Oaks, S. The damage assessment process: The application of ATC 20. In R. Bolin (ed), <i>The Loma Prieta Earthquake: Studies of short-term impacts</i> (pp. 17-24). Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, Institute of Behavioral Science, Program on Environment and Behavior.
---	--

Week Twelve: November 5-9

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recovery Tasks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure and Lifelines 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline, due November 8 <p>Reading(s):</p> <p><i>ALL READ:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phillips, B. (2009). Chapter 9: Infrastructure and Lifelines. In B. Phillips, <i>Disaster recovery</i> (pp. 263-290). New York: Taylor & Francis. <p><i>DIVIDED READINGS:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chang, Y., Wilkinson, S., Potangaroa, R., & Seville, E. (2011). Identifying factors affecting resource availability for post-disaster reconstruction: A case study in China. <i>Construction Management and Economics</i>, 29, 37-48. • Isumi, M., Nomura, N., and Shibuya, T. (1985). Simulation of post-earthquake restoration for lifeline systems. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 3(1) 87-105. • Menoni, S. (2001). Chains of damages and failures in a metropolitan environment: Some observations on the Kobe earthquake in 1995. <i>Journal of Hazardous Materials</i>, 86, 101-119. • Palliyaguru, R., Amaratunga, D., and Haigh, R. 2010. Integration of “disaster risk reduction” into infrastructure reconstruction sector: Policy vs. practice gaps. <i>International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment</i>, 1(3), 277-296. • Reed, D., Preuss, J., & Park, J. (2006). The influence of context on lifeline behavior: Local policies under wind storm and earthquake scenarios. <i>Natural Hazards</i>, 39, 289-307.
--	--

Week Thirteen: November 12-16—NO SCHOOL ON VETERAN’S DAY, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recovery Tasks 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debris Management 	<p>Reading(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brown, C., Milke, M., & Seville, E. (2011). Disaster waste management: A review article. <i>Waste Management</i>, 31, 1085-1098. • Brown, C., Milke, M., & Seville, E. (2010). Waste management s a “lifeline”? A New Zealand case study analysis. <i>International Journal of Disaster Resileince in the Built Environment</i>, 1(2), 193-206. • Fetter, G., & Rakes, T. (2012). Incorporating recycling into post-disaster debris disposal. <i>Socio-Economic Planning Sciences</i>, 46, 14-22. • Karunasena, G., Amaratunga, D., Haigh, R., & Lill, I. Post disaster waste management strategies in developing countries: Case of Sri Lanka. <i>International Journal of Strategic Property Management</i>, 13, 171-190. • Phillips, B. (2009). Chapter 4: Debris management. In B. Phillips, <i>Disaster recovery</i> (pp. 61-130). New York: Taylor & Francis.
Week Fourteen: November 19-23—NO SCHOOL ON THURSDAY AND FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22,23	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recovery Tasks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteer Management • Donations Management 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study, due November 20 <p>Reading(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phillips, B. (2009). Chapter 12: Donations, and Chapter 14: Voluntary Organizations. In B. Phillips, <i>Disaster recovery</i> (pp. 369-398, 429-464). New York: Taylor & Francis.
Week Fifteen: November 26-30	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recovery Tasks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheltering • Housing 	<p>Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <p>Reading(s):</p> <p>ALL READ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phillips, B. (2009). Chapter 7: Housing. In B. Phillips, <i>Disaster recovery</i> (pp. 187-230). New York: Taylor & Francis. <p>DIVIDED READINGS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bolin, R., & Stanford, L. (1991). Shelter, housing and recovery: A comparison of U.S. disasters. <i>Disasters</i>, 15(1), 24-34. • Jacobs, K., & Williams, S. (2011). What to do now? Tensions and dilemmas in responding to natural disasters: A study of three Australian state housing authorities. <i>International Journal of Housing Policy</i>, 11(2), 175-193. • Levine, J., Esnard, A., & Sapat, A. (2007). Population displacement and housing dilemmas due to catastrophic disasters. <i>Journal of Planning Literature</i>, 22(1), 3-15. • Phillips, B. (1993). Cultural diversity in disasters: Sheltering, housing, and long term recovery. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 11(1), 99-110. • Phillips, B., Wikle, T., Hakim, A., & Pike, L. (2012). Establishing and operating shelters after Hurricane Katina. <i>International Journal of Emergency Management</i>, 8(2), 153-167. • Zhang, Y., & Peacock, W. (2010). Planning for housing recovery? Lessons learned from Hurricane Andrew. <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i>, 76(1), 5-24.

Week Sixteen: December 3-7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recovery Tasks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Recovery Historic and Cultural Resources 	Assignment(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None Reading(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phillips, B. (2009). Chapter 5: Environmental recovery and Chapter 6: Historic and cultural resources. In B. Phillips, <i>Disaster recovery</i> (pp. 133-186). New York: Taylor & Francis. Al-Nammari, F. (2008). Long term recovery of historic buildings. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 26(1), 40-63. Evans-Cowley, J., & Zimmerman-Gough, M. Evaluating environmental protection in post-Hurricane Katrina plans in Mississippi. <i>Journal of Environmental Planning and Management</i>, 51(3), 399-419. Spennemann, D., & Graham, K. (2007). The importance of heritage preservation in natural disaster situations. <i>International Journal of Risk Assessment and Management</i>, 4(6/7), 993-1001.
Finals Week: December 10-14	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Exam, December 10 from 8-10a.m. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessing Recovery Progress Essay Part Two, due December 10 Presentations, in class December 10 	

This schedule and the readings and assignments listed within it are tentative and is subject to change at the instructor's discretion.

Evaluation

Grade Scale	Letter Grade Scale				
	Points	Percentage	Point Range	Percentage Range	Letter Grade
Graded Item					
On-the-spot- essays	60	14%	405-435	93-100%	A
Recovery Progress Essay	75	17%	365-404	84-92%	B
Research Project	180	41%	326-364	75-83%	C
Comparative Essay	100	23%	278-325	64-74%	D
Presentation	20	5%	Less than 278	0-63%	F
Total	435	100%			

Late Policy

Late assignments will receive a 10% reduction of possible points per day (Saturdays and Sundays included). Late assignments will only be accepted for five (5) calendar days after the original due date. If you know you will have difficulty getting an assignment done on time, please see the instructor in advance.