

# The Queen City's Collective and Compassionate Approach

## *Fighting Opioids and Homelessness in the Granite State*

### *Practitioner Guide*

BRIAN MANDELL, JORRIT DE JONG, GUHAN SUBRAMANIAN,  
BRADY ROBERTS, ELIZABETH PATTON, AND MONICA GIANNONE

### Overview

A case study is a story about how a person or group of people dealt with challenges or opportunities they faced. It is based on desk research and interviews with key actors, but it does not provide analysis or conclusions. It is written from the perspective of the protagonist and is designed to raise questions and generate discussion about the challenges the protagonist faced. Cases are meant to help participants develop analytical reasoning, listening, and judgment skills to help them make the best decisions in other future contexts.

A case-based conversation is a way to anchor a conceptual discussion to concrete examples. It can bring a case to life and enable discussion participants to place themselves in the shoes of the case protagonist. It should also allow participants to surface a variety of perspectives. This note is designed to help you run a conversation about the case, "The Queen City's Collective and Compassionate Approach: Fighting Opioids and Homelessness in the Granite State."

### Role of Facilitator

The facilitator leads a conversation with a clear beginning and end, ensures that everyone is heard, and keeps the group focused. The conversation can be broken into three distinct segments: exploring the case, diagnosing the challenges, and formulating takeaways. Some facilitation tips and tricks to keep in mind are below:

#### **BEFORE the discussion**

Make sure everyone takes the time to read the case to prepare for the discussion. When setting up the room, think about situating discussion participants where everyone can see each other and you. Designate a note taker, as well as a place where you can take notes on a flipchart or white board. Plan for at least seventy-five to ninety minutes to discuss the case and takeaways (depending on participants' familiarity with negotiation) and have a clock in the room and/or an assigned timekeeper. Mention that you might interrupt participants in the interest of progressing the conversation.

**DURING the discussion**

Encourage participants to debate and share opinions. State very clearly that there is no right or wrong “answer” to the case—cases are written so that reasonable people can disagree and debate different ideas and approaches. Be careful not to allow yourself or others to dominate the discussion. If the conversation is getting heated or bogged down on a particular issue, consider allowing participants to talk in pairs for a few minutes before returning to a full group discussion. Do not worry about reaching consensus, just make the most of this opportunity to practice thinking and learning together!

## Case Synopsis

Elected at the height of the opioid epidemic, Mayor Joyce Craig came to represent the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, as it grappled with the dual tragedies of substance abuse and chronic homelessness. An idealist in a state that valued personal responsibility and financial restraint, Mayor Craig had successfully expanded her City's services to those seeking treatment for opioid use disorder and shelter. However, these were hard-fought victories at every stage, and there was still much work to be done. Craig found herself on the eve of another difficult negotiation. She had recently established a diverse Taskforce on Homelessness and set her sights on permanently solving Manchester's trouble with homelessness and opioids. Next, she needed to convince conservative colleagues at the state and local alderman level to dedicate equitable funding to solving these intractable, moral challenges. (See Teaching Case Appendix 1 for a timeline of events in the case.)

## Conversation Plan

**Part 1: Exploring the Case (20 minutes)**

The goal of this part of the conversation is to review the case from the point of view of the people involved. Suggested questions:

- *What is the story in this case?*
- *What dilemma did Mayor Craig face?*
- *What was she trying to do in this case?*
- *Who were the parties in this case?*
- *What were the barriers preventing Craig from reaching her goals?*

**Part 2a: Diagnosing Negotiation Challenges (30-45 minutes)**

Ask participants to fill out the attached worksheet to prepare for the discussion in which they will be challenged to analyze who holds power in Manchester and how Craig can leverage these individuals' power to advance her goals.

NOTE: This worksheet is meant to get participants thinking intentionally about power as a helpful tool within negotiations and is less about objectively correct answers. Thus, there may be differing opinions and interpretations of the case.

This discussion section may be based on four broad topic areas:

- *Who was a powerful party in this case?*
- *Who was a weak party in this case?*
- *How can weak parties become more powerful?*
- *How well was Craig doing? Who was she under- or over-utilizing?*

**Part 2b: Application** (25 minutes)

If time allows, break the class into groups or remain in plenary to apply the concepts discussed to participants' own negotiation challenges and analyze Craig's performance thus far. Ask participants to reflect on these questions:

- *What advice would you have given Mayor Craig?*
- *In your own experience, can you think of a challenge that requires simultaneous negotiations with state/national stakeholders and local stakeholders? What are the challenges you have experienced?*
- *What are the barriers in your experience to building power as a city official? What are the opportunities?*
- *How can parties in your context build or lose power?*

**Part 3: Formulating Lessons** (10 minutes)

This part of the conversation focuses on the lessons of the case that participants will continue to reflect on and apply to challenges in their work. Some sample, high-level takeaways to review after a productive discussion are the following:

- Do not assume power is static.
- While mayors may not wield a great deal of power, they have the ability to bring people together and should think about how to shape these conversations to advance their goals.
- Good leadership may involve holding people with more power than you accountable for their obligations even if doing so presents a political risk.
- Highlighting the everyday good work of public servants is a great way to keep stakeholders engaged and bring attention to issues that require further consideration.
- When and how you engage stakeholders and form coalitions is critical for getting things done when you lack substantial power.

## Appendix

### Appendix 1 Worksheet: Pre-Diagnosis Questions

This case deals with leveraging power within a relationship and how parties can build or lose power in large-scale, multiparty contexts. Below are a few forms of power you might have noticed in Manchester.

Using the parties listed below, first read each the definition of power and fill in the third column regarding which parties in this case possess each form of power. Certain parties may have several forms of power to tap into, and several powers are held by multiple parties.

**Parties:** Mayor Craig | Neighboring Communities | Governor Sununu | State Legislators  
 Manchester Aldermen | Local Advocacy Community | Manchester Public Servants

Type of Power	What is it?	Party?
Shift Power	Able to shift between acceptable deals	
Convening Power	Bringing people to the table	
Veto Power	Able to stop a deal	
(Dual) Mandate Power	Derived from legal mandates	
Momentum Power	“The train has left the station”	
Suasion Power	Appeal to morals and ethics, community values	
Nuisance Power	Able to make their interests a problem for another party	
Coalitional Power	Large group of allies to lean on for support and guidance	

Source: Case study authors