

EMGT 763: Response Theory and Practice Spring 2012

Class Day and Time: Tuesdays and Thursdays from 11:00a.m. to 12:15p.m.

Class Location: Minard Hall, Room 135

Credits: 3

Instructor: Dr. Jessica Jensen

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

Email: EMAIL THROUGH BLACKBOARD

Office: 102D Putnam

Office Hours: Tues. & Thurs. 1:00-3:00pm and by appointment

Bulletin Description

“Examination of theory and practice in the relationship between incident command systems and emergency operating centers” NOTE: The Department of Emergency Management has changed the bulletin description since registration for the course. It will read henceforth as “Examination of the theory and practice of response including response variance and effectiveness”

Course Goal

Instead of solely seeking to engage course participants in knowledge memorization, basic comprehension, and application of basic response functions, management techniques, structures, and the like, the purpose of this course is to engage course participants in the academic pursuit of inductive and deductive analysis, synthesis, and evaluation related to response topics. While we will certainly cover basic response material, we will quickly move past this material. Thus, it will be of benefit to have a background in response coming into this 700 level course.

The first part of the course will be devoted to developing and discussing a theoretical framework for response within the academic discipline of emergency management. The second part of the course will explore how individuals and households respond to disasters pre- and post- impact. The third part of the course will examine how organizations respond to disasters. And, the fourth, and final, part of the course will delve into how communities (broadly defined) respond.

Through a mix of lecture, guided discussion, presentations, and writing assignments, the class will pursue answers related to two questions:

1. What do we *know* about response?

Emergency management is interested in how people cope with hazard events—particularly through the activities they undertake. Thus, we want to discover what activities the literature suggests are involved in response as well as patterns, processes, and change related to who is involved and how they behave. It is important that we carefully evaluate the strength of this literature (e.g., assumptions that underlie the literature, quality of the methodology, link between theory and findings, link between findings and results, and extent to which findings have been consistent across studies) so we can develop a better understanding of what we actually know. As we analyze, synthesize, and evaluate the literature we will repeatedly

consider the implications of our findings and discussions for both the profession and emerging academic discipline of emergency management.

2. How might response effectiveness be assessed for individuals and households, organizations, and communities?

A central concern of emergency management as an emerging discipline is not just how people cope with hazard events through response activities but also how people can cope with hazard events effectively. We will explore the meaning of the term effectiveness and how it can be assessed with respect to different units of analysis involved in response. Course participants will individually and as a class wrestle with operationalizing their assessment ideas.

Objectives

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

- Describe elements of a theoretical framework for studying response from an emergency management perspective;
- Articulate the activities involved in individual and household, organization, and community (broadly defined) response;
- Identify response patterns and processes found in the literature related to who is involved in response activities and response behavior;
- Identify what, if any, change has been observed in who is involved in response and response behavior;
- Assess areas of strength and weakness in the response literature and provide evidence to support that assessment;
- Articulate the status of the response body of knowledge (based on what is covered in class) and the implications for the profession and emerging discipline of emergency management; and,
- Suggest and defend a means of assessing the effectiveness of response for individuals and households, organizations, and communities (broadly defined).

Course Expectations

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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

Required Reading (0 points)

There will not be a required text for this course; however, there will be significant reading assignments associated with each week of class. Each course participant is expected to complete all of the assigned readings listed in the tentative course schedule when the readings for the week are accompanied by the phrase “*RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL*”. When the phrase “*DIVIDED READINGS*” accompanies the list of readings for the week, then the articles listed will be divided amongst course participants (e.g., If there were 12 listed readings, then each participant might read only 4.). The articles are all accessible in electronic format through the library or interlibrary loan.

Assessments (5 points each, 15 points total)

Course participants will complete a pre, mid, and post-assessment of their knowledge related to the material and topics covered in the course and/or their learning style. The due dates for the

assessments are listed in the Course Schedule. The instructor will post a link to the assessments in the Assignments section of Blackboard OR the instructor may distribute paper copies of the assessments in class. The assessments are evaluated for completion only. They are NOT tests and are NOT graded for accuracy of your answers. The assessments are for the instructor to gauge participant learning and/or needs related to learning style from the beginning to the end of the course.

On-the-spot Responses (10 points each, approximately 100 points total)

Participants will participate in approximately ten on-the-spot responses to questions requiring participants to demonstrate their knowledge, comprehension, and/or ability to apply what they have learned in course activities and reading assignments. 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 differences between hazard events from an emergency management perspective, why the body of response literature developed as it did, or why there is an “international conundrum” when it comes to the study of response.

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 (2 minute max) 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 three criteria:

- 1) *Accuracy*—Was what was stated consistent with lecture and the reading assignments? Worth up to 4 points.
- 2) *Thoroughness*—Was something significant omitted from lecture, discussion, and the reading assignments that ought to have been included? Worth up to 3 points.
- 3) *Evidence*—Was appropriate evidence from lecture and the reading assignments provided to support the response? Worth up to 3 points.

Response Effectiveness Essay (100 points)

The purpose of the paper is for participants to suggest, operationalize, and defend how the effectiveness of response might be assessed for the unit of analysis they choose (i.e., individuals and households, organizations, or communities). Participants will select the unit of analysis for their essay within the first two weeks of class. If a participant finds that response effectiveness for their chosen unit of analysis is overwhelming, then, in consultation with the course instructor, they can further narrow their unit of analysis for their essay.

In the essay, participants must define response effectiveness for their unit of analysis, suggest the elements that would need to be assessed to consider the response effective, and the criteria that would be used for each element. Evidence from lecture and/or reading assignments must be used to support and defend the means of assessing response effectiveness you propose (evidence from outside the course may also be used). And, participants must articulate how the means of assessing response effectiveness they suggest could be expected to benefit the profession and/or emerging discipline of emergency management.

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, tables (if provided) should be in a consistent format, and all references should be in APA format. The grade sheet that will be used to evaluate the assignment are currently posted in the Assignments Folder, Contents Section of Blackboard.

A paper copy of the assignment is due in class on the due date listed in the tentative course schedule in this syllabus. NOTE: The day a participant submits their essay to the course instructor is also the day the participant will give a short presentation of their assessment proposal.

Response Effectiveness Research Design (75 points)

Participants will propose a research design for studying response effectiveness for the unit of analysis they choose. Note: *Participants cannot develop a research design related to the same unit of analysis on which they write their essay.*

The research designs should be 3-5 pages, single-spaced, in 12 point font, with 1 inch margins, and include the introduction, literature review, methods, and significance section headings and within the methods section the design should include data collection and sampling subheadings, and all references should be in APA format. More information about the assignment and the grade sheet that will be used to evaluate the assignment are currently posted in the Assignments Folder, Contents Section of Blackboard. A paper copy of the assignment is due in class on the due date listed in the tentative course schedule in this syllabus.

NOTE: The day a participant submits their design to the course instructor is also the day the participant will give a short presentation of their research design idea.

Presentations (25 points each, 50 points total)

PRESENTERS: Participants will give two informal presentations over the course of the semester—one related to their essay and one related to their research design. The purpose of the presentation is for you to relate your ideas and engage in a question and answer period with your colleagues and the course instructor about your essay or/research design. Your presentation should last no longer than 15 minutes; and, your question and answer period will be no shorter than 10 minutes. You are encouraged to provide your colleagues and the course instructor with an abstract, outline, or other supplementary material BUT you are discouraged from developing a power point or making use of other media. The grade sheet that will be used to evaluate the assignment are currently posted in the Assignments Folder, Contents Section of Blackboard.

COLLEAGUES: These presentations are intended to set the stage for guided class discussion over 1-2 class periods about how response effectiveness might be assessed. Class discussion may go on to synthesize some of the presenters' ideas, refine one presenter's idea, or begin from scratch. Other course participants and the course instructor have a role to play in the presentations. It is expected that the entire class will listen to the presenter, take notes, and ask questions of their colleagues—not with the intent of “catching them in a mistake” or embarrassing them but to probe for deeper or more complete understanding. Examples of questions one might ask include: “What were your reasons for X?”, “You did not include X, why?”, “Can you re-explain X? I did not quite understand.”

Literature Review (150 points)

Course participants should review the famous 1920 study of the Halifax Explosion conducted by Samuel Prince (provided in the Assignments Folder, Content Section of Blackboard). Participants should choose any interesting major response concept introduced or finding that is presented in the study and, with instructor approval, conduct a literature review that reports and analyzes the literature related to that concept or finding from 1920 to date.

Your literature review must address and support with evidence the following: 1) the degree to which support for the concept/finding introduced by Prince (1920) is evidenced in the literature; 2) the degree to which further study of the concept/finding has revealed new dimensions of the concept/finding otherwise refined the concept/finding; 3) in more or less general terms, the strength of the work you reviewed (e.g., methodology, basis in the literature, connection between the literature and findings, and connection between methodology and presentation of findings); 4) the implications of the literature you reviewed for the profession and/or emerging discipline of emergency management.

A minimum of 20 references must be included. Note: You may use reading assignments from class as part of your literature review as appropriate. There is no minimum or maximum length for the essays. It is not expected that a well-crafted essay would require more than 15 pages of text. Essays should be double-spaced, in 12 point font, with 1 inch margins on all sides, tables (if provided) should be in a consistent format, and all references should be in APA format. The grade sheet that will be used to evaluate the assignment are currently posted in the Assignments Folder, Contents Section of Blackboard. A paper copy of the assignment is due in class on the due date listed in the tentative course schedule in this syllabus.

Evaluation

<i>Graded Item</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Point Range</i>	<i>Percentage Range</i>	<i>Letter Grade</i>
Assessments	15	3%	456-490	93-100%	A
<i>On-the-Spot Responses*</i>	<i>100*</i>	<i>19%*</i>	412-455	84-92%	B
Presentations	50	9.5%	368-411	75-83%	C
Effectiveness Essay	100	19%	314-367	64-74%	D
Effectiveness Design	75	19%	Less than 314	0-63%	F
Literature Review	150	28.5%			
Total	490	100%			

* The point value associated with this graded item as well as the percentage of the total points it represents in the class may vary from the numbers provided—they are estimates only.

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.

Tentative Course Schedule

MODULE 1: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR COURSE	
Week One: January 9-13	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency management in higher education • History of the study of response • Differences in response for types of hazard events 	Activities and Assignment(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecture (T and TH)
	Reading(s): <i>RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auf der heide, E. (1989). <i>Disaster response</i> (pp. 4-10 and 33-51). St. Louis, CV Mosby. • Quarantelli, E. (1988). Disaster studies: An analysis of social historical factors affecting research in the area. Preliminary Paper #128. Newark, DE: Disaster Research Center. • Quarantelli, E. Emergencies, disasters, and catastrophes are different phenomena. Preliminary Paper # 304. Newark, DE: Disaster Research Center.
Week Two: January 16-20	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The International Conundrum • Complex Humanitarian Crises 	Activities and Assignment(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecture (T) • Guided Discussion (TH) • Possible On-the-Spot Response • Complete Pre-assessment, due the 17th
	Reading(s): <i>RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Albala-Bertrand, J. (2000). Responses to complex humanitarian emergencies and natural disasters: An analytical comparison. <i>Third World Quarterly</i> 21(2), 215-227. • De Ville de Goyet, C. (2008). Information gaps in relief, recovery, and reconstruction in the aftermath of natural disasters. In S. Amin and M. Goldstein (eds), <i>Data against natural disasters</i> (pp. 23-58.) Washington, DC: World Bank. • Fisher, D. (2007). Domestic regulation of international humanitarian relief in disasters and armed conflict: A comparative analysis. <i>International Review of the Red Cross</i> 89(866), 345-372. • McLuckie, B. (1975). Centralization and natural disaster response: A preliminary hypothesis and interpretations. <i>Mass Emergencies</i>, 1, 1-9. • Quarantelli, E. (1986). Research findings on organizational behavior in disasters and their applicability in developing countries. Preliminary Paper #107. Newark, DE: Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware.
Week Three: January 23-27	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concepts and definitions • Units of analysis in 	Activities and Assignment(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecture (T and TH) • Possible On-the-Spot Response
	Readings(s): <i>RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL</i>

<p>response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response context • Assumptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depoorter, B. (2006). Horizontal political externalities: The supply and demand of disaster management. <i>Duke Law Journal</i> 56, 101-125. • Kettl, D. Contingent coordination: Practical and theoretical puzzles for homeland security. <i>American Review of Public Administration</i> 33(3), 253-277. • Quarantelli, E. (1981). An agent specific or an all disaster spectrum approach to socio-behavioral aspects of earthquakes? Preliminary Paper #69. Newark, DE: Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware. • Quarantelli, E. (1991). Disaster response: Generic or hazard specific? In <i>Managing natural disasters and the environment</i>. Washington DC: World Bank. • Wamsley, G and Schroeder, A. (1996). "Escalating in a quagmmire: The changing dynamics of the emergency management policy subsystem." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 56(3): 235-244.
---	--

MODULE TWO: INDIVIDUAL AND HOUSEHOLD (IH) RESPONSE

Week Four: January 30-February 3

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IH Pre-impact Behavior <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Special Focus:</i> Warning 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecture (T) • Guided Discussion (TH) <p>Reading(s): <i>RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baker, E. (1979). Predicting response to hurricane warnings: A reanalysis of data from four studies. <i>Mass Emergencies</i>, 4, 9-24. • Balluz, L., L. Schieve, T. Holmes, S. Kiezak, J. Malilay. (2000). Predictors for people's response to a tornado warning: Arkansas, 1 March 1997. <i>Disasters</i> 24(1):71-77. • Mileti, D., & Fitzpatrick, C. (1992). The causal sequence of risk communication in the Parkfield Earthquake Experiment. <i>Risk Analysis</i>, 12(3), 393-400.
---	---

Week Five: February 6-10

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IH Pre-impact Behavior <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Special Focus:</i> Evacuation 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecture (T) • Guided Discussion (TH) • Possible On-the-Spot Response <p>Reading (s): <i>RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abe, K., & Kazama, R. (1985). A psychological analysis of the evacuation behavior at the Great Sakata Fire. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 3(1), 133-146. • Dash, N., & Gladwin, H. Evacuation decision making and behavioral responses: Individual and household. <i>Natural Hazards Review</i>, 8(3), 69-77. • Kang, J., Lindell, M., & Prater, C. (2007). Hurricane evacuation expectations and actual behavior in Hurricane Lili. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</i>, 37(4), 887-903. • Stein, R., Duenas-Osorio, L., Subramanian, D. (2010). Who evacuates when hurricanes approach? The role of risk, information, and location. <i>Social Science Quarterly</i>, 91(3), 816-834.
--	---

Week Six: February 13-17	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IH Pre-Post Impact Behavior <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Special Focus</i>: Sheltering 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecture (T) • Guided Discussion (TH) <hr/> <p>Reading(s): <i>RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chien, S., Chen, L., Chang, S., Chiu, G., & Chu, C. (2002). Development of an after earthquake disaster shelter evaluation model. <i>Journal of the Chinese Institute of Engineers</i>, 25(5), 591-596. • Mileti, D., & Sorenson, J. (1992). Toward an explanation of mass care shelter use in evacuations. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 10(1), 25-42.
Week Seven: February 20-24	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IH Post Impact Behavior <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Myths, Helping Behavior, 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecture (T) • Guided Discussion (TH) • Possible On-the-Spot Response <hr/> <p>Reading(s): <i>DIVIDED READINGS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barsky, L., Trainor, J., & Torres, M. (2006). Disaster realities in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina: Revisiting the looting myth. Quick Response Grant #184. Boulder, CO: Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado at Boulder. • Dynes, R., & Quarantelli, E.L. (1980). "Helping behavior in large-scale disasters". In <i>Participation in social and political activities</i> (pp. 339-354). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. • Dynes, R. (2003). Finding order in disorder: Continuities in the 9-11 response. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 21(3), 9-23. • Fritz, C., & Williams, H. (1957). The human being in disasters: A research perspective. <i>The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</i>, 309, 42-51. • Helsloot, I., & Ruitenber, A. (2004). Citizen response to disasters: A survey of literature and some practical implications. <i>Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management</i>, 12(3), 98-111. • Lowe, S. (2002). Community response in a terrorist disaster. Quick Response Report #144. Boulder, CO: Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado. • Mikami, S., & Ikeda, K. (1985). Human response to disasters. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 3(2), 107-132. • Mileti, D., & O'Brien, P. Warnings during disaster: Normalizing communicated risk. <i>Social Problems</i>, 39(1), 40-57. • O'Brien, P., & Mileti, D. (1992). Citizen participation in emergency response following the Loma Prieta Earthquake. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 10(1), 71-89. • Quarantelli, E. (2008). Conventional beliefs and counterintuitive realities. <i>Social Research</i>, 75(3), 873-904. • Trainor, J., & Barsky, L. (2011). Reporting for duty? A synthesis of research on role conflict, strain, and abandonment among emergency

	<p>responders during disasters and catastrophes. Miscellaneous Report #71. Newark, DE: Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zahran, S., O’Conner Shelley, T., Peek, L., & Brody, S. (2009). Natural disasters and social order: Modeling crime outcomes in Florida. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 27(1), 26-52.
Week Eight: February 27-March 2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studying IH Behavior in Emergency Management 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IH Response Effectiveness Essays, due February 28th IH Response Design Essays, due February 28th IH Response Effectiveness Presentations, in-class the 28th
	<p>Reading(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.
MODULE THREE: ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSE	
Week Nine: March 5-9	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response organizations Elements of organizational response Performance of response organizations 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lecture (T and TH) Possible On-the-Spot Response Mid-semester Assessment, due the 8th
	<p>Reading(s): <i>RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mileti, D., & Sorenson, J. (1987). Determinants of organizational effectiveness in responding to low probability catastrophic events. <i>Columbia Journal of World Business</i>, 22(1), 13-21. Quarantelli, E., & Dynes, R. (1977). Different types of organizations in disaster responses and their operational problems. Preliminary Paper #41. Newark, DE: Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware. Bardo, J. (1978). Organizational response to disaster: A typology of adaptation and change. <i>Mass Emergencies</i>, 3, 87-104.
Week Ten: March 12-16	
<i>SPRING BREAK—NO CLASS</i>	
Week Eleven: March 19-23	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational Response continued 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guided Discussion Possible On-the-Spot Response
	<p>Reading(s): <i>DIVIDED READINGS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forrest, T. (1970). Hurricane Betsy: A selective analysis of organizational response. Working Paper #27. Newark, DE: Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware. Morris, J., Morris, E., & Jones, D. (2007). Reaching for the philosopher’s stone: Contingent coordination and the military’s response to Hurricane Katrina. <i>Public Administration Review</i> 67(Special Issue), 94-106. Scanlon, J. (1999). Emergent groups in established frameworks: Ottawa Carleton’s responses to the 1998 ice disaster. <i>Journal of Contingencies</i>

	<p><i>and Crisis Management</i>, 7(1), 30-37.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sutton, J. (2002). The response of faith-based organizations in New York City following the World Trade Center Attacks on September 11, 2001. Quick Response Report #147. Boulder, CO: Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado. • United States Senate. (2005). Hurricane Katrina: What can we learn from the private sector response? Hearing before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. Available at: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-109shrg24932/pdf/CHRG-109shrg24932.pdf.
Week Twelve: March 26-30	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studying Organizational Response in Emergency Management 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORG Response Effectiveness Essays, due the 27th • ORG Response Design Essays, due the 27th • ORG Response Effectiveness Presentations, in-class the 27th <p>Reading(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None.
MODULE FOUR: COMMUNITY RESPONSE	
Week Thirteen: April 2-6	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functions • Structures • Learning 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecture (T and TH) • Possible On-the-Spot Response • LITERATURE REVIEWS, due the 6th by midnight <p>Reading(s): <i>RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drabek, T. (1983). Alternative patterns of decision-making in emergent disaster response networks. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 1(2), 277-305 • Kreps, G. (1983) "The organization of disaster response: core concepts and processes." <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 439-465. • Schneider, S. (1992) "Governmental response to disasters: The conflict between bureaucratic procedures and emergency norms." <i>Public Administration Review</i>, 52(2): 135-145.
Week Fourteen: April 9-13	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response Issues 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guided Discussion (T and TH) • Possible On-the-Spot Response

	<p>Reading(s): <i>DIVIDED READINGS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comfort, L., & Kapucu, N. (2006). Inter-organizational coordination in extreme events: The World Trade Center attacks, September 11, 2001. <i>Natural Hazards</i>, 39, 309-327. • Eriksson, K. (2009). Knowledge transfer between preparedness and emergency response: a case study. <i>Disaster Prevention and Management</i>, 18(2), 162-169. • Huang, C., Wang, J., Lin, T. (2010). Resource sufficiency, organizational cohesion, and organizational effectiveness of emergency response. <i>Natural Hazards</i>, 58(1), 221-234. • Katirai, M., & Simpson, D. Large-scale rooftop search and rescue: The experience of Hurricane Katrina. Quick Response Report #201. Boulder, CO: Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado at Boulder. • McEntire, D., & Cope, J. (2004). Damage assessment after the Paso Robles (San Simeon, California) Earthquake: Lessons for emergency management. Quick Response Report #166. Boulder, CO: Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado at Boulder. • Sorenson, J., & Mileti, D. (1987). Decision-making uncertainties in emergency warning system organizations. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 5(1), 33-61.
--	---

Week Fifteen: April 16-20

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Studies 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guided Discussion (T and TH) • Possible On-the-Spot Response <p>Reading(s): <i>DIVIDED READINGS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brouillette, J., & Ross, J. (1967). Organizational Response to the Great Chicago Snowstorm of 1967. Research Note #14. Columbus, OH: Disaster Research Center, Ohio State University. • Kearney, M. (1972). Uncoordinated collective response: The Buffalo Creek Hollow Dam Break Disaster of February 26, 1972. Working Paper #45. Columbus, OH: Disaster Research Center, Ohio State University. • Kueneman, R., Smith, M., Taylor, V., & Waxman, J. (1973). Observations on community coordination during the May 27, 1973 Jonesboro, Arkansas Tornado. Working Paper #53. Columbus, OH: Disaster Research Center, Ohio State University. • Quarantelli, E. (1978). The Vaiont Dam overflow: A case study of extra-community responses in massive disasters. Preliminary Paper #50. Columbus, OH: Disaster Research Center, Ohio State University. • Smith, M., & Bardo, J. (1973). Some observations on organizational response to the snowstorm in Des Moines, Iowa, April 9, 1973. Working Paper #51. Columbus, OH: Disaster Research Center, Ohio State University. • Stephens, H. (1993). The Texas City Disaster: A re-examination. <i>Organization & Environment</i>, 7(3), 189-204. • Stiles, W. (1955). How a community met a disaster: Yuba City Flood, December 1955. <i>The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</i>, 309, 160-169.
--	--

Week Sixteen: April 23-27	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case Studies 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guided Discussion (T and TH) Possible On-the-Spot Response <hr/> <p>Reading(s): <i>DIVIDED READINGS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant, N., Hoover, D., Scarisbrick-Hauser, A., & Muffet, S. (2002). Terrorism in Shanksville: A study in preparedness and response. Quick Response Report #157. Boulder, CO: Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado at Boulder. McEntire, D. (2001). Multi-organizational coordination during the response to the March 28, 2000, Fort Worth Tornado: An assessment of constraining and contributing factors. Quick Response Report #143. Boulder, CO: Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado at Boulder. McEntire, D. (1999). A review of relief: An examination of the response to Hurricane Georges in the Dominican Republic. Quick Response Report #115. Boulder, CO: Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado at Boulder. Morrow, B., & Ragsdale, A. (1996). Early response to Hurricane Marilyn in the U.S. Virgin Islands. Quick Response Report #82. Boulder, CO: Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado at Boulder. Nigg, J. (1997). Emergency response following the 1994 Northridge Earthquake: Intergovernmental coordination issues. Preliminary Paper #250. Newark, DE: Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware. Stallings, R., & Schepart, C. (1987). Contrasting local government responses to a tornado disaster in two communities. <i>International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters</i>, 5(3), 265-284.
Week Seventeen: April 30-May 4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studying Community Response in Emergency Management 	<p>Activities and Assignment(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> COMM Response Effectiveness Presentations, in-class the 1st Guided Discussion (TH) COMM Response Effectiveness Essays, due the 1st COMM Response Design Essays, due the 1st Post-Assessment, due the 4th <hr/> <p>Reading(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.
Finals Week: May 7-11	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monday, May 7 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.—Note: We will meet in our classroom during this time period. 	