INSTRUCTOR’S INFORMATION:

Timothy Seidel
Email: timothy.seidel@emu.edu
Phone: 540 432 4161
Office: Roselawn 223
Office hours: Mondays/Wednesdays, 10 a.m.-12 p.m., or by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This course is designed to develop participants’ understanding and skills for effectively influencing policymaking processes on peacebuilding issues. We will explore policymaking within local, national and international contexts. Moving from an exploration of “what is governance” and “what is policy” and their relevance to peacebuilding, we will learn basic approaches for policy analysis and policy formation. We will map the diverse actors involved in policymaking and assess factors that influence their decisions. We will explore strategies to influence policy development—including advocacy, public campaigning and policy dialogue—and practice key skills for effective engagement, including crafting policy briefs and advocacy communication. Students will have the opportunity to give specific attention to their chosen area of specialization with course work geared to applying what is being learned. Participants will choose a key issue of interest to them and will critique existing policy, identify and advocate alternatives, and develop materials to support their case.

COURSE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

1. Develop a sound understanding of the relevance of public policy to peacebuilding.
2. Explore policymaking processes and identify the roles and interests of actors typically involved in these processes.
3. Understand a range of strategies for effectively influencing policy debates and to apply this understanding to develop a tailored advocacy strategy to address a specific policy concern.
4. Become more skillful in various methods of engaging in policy work, including policy analysis, strategy formulation and strategic communication.
5. Be able to critically assess the connection between the ‘key asks’ of a policy influencing effort and the change desired - and to assess how the framing of messages and goals influences the response of target audiences and others.
6. Improve analytical and scholarly writing skills.
7. Develop effective policy advocacy materials, which participants can optionally refine and use in applied practice to influence a policy debates on issues that concern them.

REQUIRED TEXTS AND OTHER RESOURCES:

4. Additional readings will be posted on Moodle (see “References” section below). **Some reading assignments may change over the course of the semester.**

**REQUIRED ASSIGNMENTS:**

Course evaluation will be based on students’ demonstration of critically engaging, analyzing, and applying the course material. In order to do this, course requirements include class participation and discussion, student presentations on assigned readings, and completing a comprehensive policy project. The final grade will be based on:

- 30% Class participation and discussion
- 25% Policy review
- 25% Advocacy strategy
- 20% Policy brief

Students taking the course for 3 credits are required to complete all assignments. Students taking the course for 2 credits are not required to complete the advocacy strategy. Students taking the course for 1 credit are not required to complete the policy review or advocacy strategy.

**Class participation and discussion (30%):** This class will be in a seminar format, therefore student participation is essential. Students are expected to come to class on time, to participate fully in the discussions and exercises, and to constructively support the learning and skills development of others in the course. Any sessions missed will result in a reduced grade. It is the responsibility of any student who misses a session to contact the instructor. Evaluation will be based on students’ demonstration of critically engaging, absorbing, comprehending, and analyzing the course material (see the participation rubric).

Because of this interactive format, we want to ensure a healthy, safe space for conversation and learning. Among other things, this includes active listening, asking questions respectfully, openness to multiple voices, finding your own perspective while respecting others’ perspectives, and being aware of the room; in other words participating in ways that invite the participation of your colleagues. Please turn off and put away all cellular phones, tablets, and laptops.

Beginning with week 2, discussion will be triggered by student groups responsible for critically evaluating—not primarily summarizing—the readings and suggesting leading questions for discussion. Each student is responsible for presenting the reading for two weeks out of the syllabus. Presentation should focus on setting and running a conversation about the material—taking roughly 15-20 minutes to critically evaluate the readings, connect the ideas to contemporary issues or life experiences, and 25 minutes to facilitate a class discussion. Each group should collaboratively make an outline of their presentation, including discussion questions, and email to their colleagues by 5pm the day before class.

In addition to core readings, students will be expected to read much more in-depth on the policy issue of their choice, which will include tracking that topic in popular and specialized media, as well as scholarly sources, over time during the course. Additionally, to get a feel for the formal nature of policymaking environments, students will need to observe and reflect on a

- **Local government meeting:** In September, all participants should observe a local government meeting, ideally with other classmates, write a report (500-750 words), and be ready to discuss the
issues during the class session on September 30. These could include meetings of City Councils or Boards of Supervisors, School Boards, or Planning Commissions from the City of Harrisonburg, Rockingham County, or other localities. Of particular interest might be meetings of the Harrisonburg City Council on September 13 or 27, or the Planning Commission on September 14.

Policy research, advocacy strategy, and policy brief (70%):

- **Policy topic proposal**: Each student will need to identify a specific policy concern that they will focus on throughout the course. This topic will be the focus of their policy review, advocacy strategy, and policy brief. A one paragraph description of this policy topic is due September 9.

- **Policy review**: Each student will write a policy review on their chosen topic, synthesizing the existing state of policy on this issue, and identifying potential policy options and policy change goals (3000-3500 words). This essay should be fully referenced and consistent with EMU’s graduate writing standards and is due October 14. (25%)

- **Advocacy strategy presentation and memo**: Each student will prepare an advocacy strategy that, if successfully implemented, could plausibly shape policymaking on the issue of concern to them. Each student will make their presentation on December 2 and receive oral feedback from the instructor and other participants. There will be opportunity for refining the strategy before submitting the final version in memo form on December 6. (25%)

- **Policy brief and presentation**: Each student will develop a policy brief with the key messages and key ‘asks’ or recommendations for the policy change goal they have identified for their topic. Students will present their policy pitch and hand out their policy brief on the final day of class, December 16. An important goal of this assignment is to develop a well-written policy brief that can serve as a writing sample when you apply for future internships or jobs. (20%)

N.B.: Assignments should be double-spaced, 12-point, Times Roman Numerical font, one-inch margins. All references should be properly cited using a consistent reference style (e.g. APA, MLA, Chicago). Assignments are due at the beginning of class on the due date. Late assignments will result in a deduction of half a grade for each day late.

These are brief descriptions of required graded assignments for the course. More details for each assignment can be found on the “Guidance Notes” that will be provided in class.

### Schedule and Topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1 Sep 2</td>
<td>Governance, Policy, and Power: Why Does It Matter for Peacebuilding?</td>
<td>Richmond (ch 1), Paris, Spivak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 Sep 9</td>
<td>Peacebuilding Debates: a. The liberal peace and the role of the international community b. Peacebuilding from the “bottom-up”: Local perceptions and the role of civil society</td>
<td>Funk, Richmond (chs 5, 7), Jabri, Sabaratnam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Policy Topic Proposal Due</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 Sep 16</td>
<td>Politics and Governance, part 1</td>
<td>Rourke, Stone (intro, ch 1), Sinclair (chs 1-3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 Sep 23</td>
<td>Politics and Governance, part 2</td>
<td>Sinclair (chs 4-9).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Week 5  | Sep 30 | Policymaking, part 1:  
a. Policymaking goals: What is public policy?  
b. Policymaking in action: Localized policy systems  
*You should have prepared for and attended a local governance meeting prior to this class and be prepared to discuss what you have experienced.  
*Local Government Meeting Report Due | Stone (chs 2-6), Birkland (chs 1, 6),  

| Week 6  | Oct 7  | Policymaking, part 2:  
a. Policymaking problems  
b. Policy formation: Understanding the policy cycle  
*We will workshop your policy review research. Be prepared to discuss what you are learning related to policy formation on this topic and to identify where the issue is currently located in the policy cycle. | Stone (chs 7-11), Horowitz,  
Center for Lobbying in the Public Interest  

| Week 7  | Oct 14 | Policymaking, part 3  
a. Policymaking solutions  
b. Policy influencing: The role of public participation  
*Policy Review Due | Stone (chs 12-16, conc.),  
Piper and von Lieres, Malina et al., World Bank  

| Week 8  | Oct 21 | Policymaking, part 4:  
a. Policymaking in action: International policy campaign case study  
b. Policy formation: Mapping issues, institutions, actors and interests  
*Prior to class: after completing the readings, identify the decision-making bodies for your policy topic and the key stakeholders with an interest in your issue. | Adrian-Paul,  
Conciliation Resources, World Bank  

| Week 9  | Oct 28 | Strategic Communications: At the heart of any policy influencing process  
*Prior to class: complete the Website Communication Strategy Exercise by reviewing the websites of advocacy groups and answering the questions. | World Bank, Fenton, Fenton  


| Week 11  | Nov 11 | Policy Influencing Methods, part 2: Expert Advocacy  
*Prior to class: complete the Policy Report Review Exercise and answer questions, based on reviewing 3 policy reports to understand the style and approach used. | Barnes, Fenton  

| Week 12  | Nov 18 | Policy Influencing Methods, part 3: Public Campaigns | Peters, Hubert, Center for Lobbying in the Public Interest  

| Week 13  | Thanksgiving Break |  |
Nov 25

Week 14
Dec 2
Advocacy Strategy Presentation and Peer Review
*The presentation will be due today, but the written memo outlining the strategy is due Tuesday December 6.

*Advocacy Strategy Presentation and Peer Review

Week 15
Dec 9
Skills Development: Lobbying Strategies and Skills

Center for Lobbying in the Public Interest, Meadowcroft.

Week 16
Dec 16
Policy Briefs and Presentations
*Be prepared to lobby for your policy issue and to distribute your completed policy brief to all members of the class.

*Policy Brief and Presentation Due

**GRADING CRITERIA AND OTHER POLICIES:**

**Writing Guidelines:**
Writing will be a factor in evaluation: EMU has adopted a set of writing guidelines for graduate programs that include six sets of criteria: content, structure, rhetoric & style, information literacy, source integrity, and conventions (see page 3). It is expected that graduates will be able to write at least a “good” level with 60% writing at an “excellent” level. For the course papers, please follow the APA style described in CJP’s GUIDELINES for GRADUATE PAPERS (see CJP Student Resources moodle page or request a copy from the Academic Program Coordinator), unless directed otherwise by the instructor.

**Academic Integrity Policy (AIP):**
EMU faculty and staff care about the integrity of their own work and the work of their students. They create assignments that promote interpretative thinking and work intentionally with students during the learning process. Honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility are characteristics of a community that is active in loving mercy and doing justice. EMU defines plagiarism as occurring when a person presents as one’s own someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source (Adapted from the Council of Writing Program Administrators). This course will apply EMU’s AIP to any events of academic dishonesty. For more information see http://emu.edu/writing-program/faculty-services/student-academic-integrity-policy2015.pdf. If you have doubts about what is appropriate, one useful website is http://www.indiana.edu/~istd/.

**Turnitin:**
Students are accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. Thus, you should be familiar with EMU’s Academic Integrity Policy (see above) in order to meet the academic expectations concerning appropriate documentation of sources. In addition, EMU is using Turnitin, a learning tool and plagiarism prevention system. For CJP classes, you may be asked to submit your papers to Turnitin from Moodle. For more information about Turnitin, with instructions for using it see: https://guides.turnitin.com/01_Manuals_and_Guides/Student/Student_QuickStart_Guide.

**Moodle:**
Moodle (https://moodle.emu.edu/) is the online learning platform that EMU has chosen to provide to faculty, administrators and students. Students will have access to course information within Moodle for any class they are registered for in a given term. The amount of time a student has access to information
before and after the class is somewhat dependent on the access given to students by the individual faculty member. However, please note that courses are not in Moodle permanently – after two years the class will no longer be accessible. Please be sure to download resources from Moodle that you wish to have ongoing access to.

**Grading Scale & Feedback:**

In most courses grades will be based on an accumulation of numerical points that will be converted to a letter grade at the end of the course (several CJP courses are graded pass/fail). Assignments will receive a score expressed as a fraction, with the points received over the total points possible (e.g., 18/20). The following is the basic scale used for evaluation. Points may be subtracted for missed deadlines.

- 95-100 = A outstanding
- 90-94 = A- excellent
- 85-89 = B+ very good
- 80-84 = B good
- 76-79 = B- satisfactory
- 73-75 = C+ passing
- 70-72 = C unsatisfactory
- Below 70 = F failing

Graduate students are expected to earn A's & B's. A GPA of 3.0 for MA students and 2.75 for GC students is the minimum requirement for graduation.

*Regarding feedback on papers/projects:* Students can expect to receive papers/assignments back in a class with faculty feedback before the next paper/assignment is due. This commitment from faculty assumes that the student has turned the paper in on the agreed upon due date.

**Institutional Review Board:**

All research conducted by or on EMU faculty, staff or students must be reviewed by the Institutional Review Board to assure participant safety: [http://www.emu.edu/irb/](http://www.emu.edu/irb/).

**Graduate & Professional Studies Writing Center:**

Please utilize the writing center! They offer free individual tutoring from graduate student tutors. Please see [http://www.emu.edu/writing-program/](http://www.emu.edu/writing-program/) for more information, including how to schedule appointments.

**Office of Academic Access:**

If you have a physical, psychological, medical or learning disability that may impact your work in this course, it is your responsibility to contact the Office of Academic Access in the Academic Success Center on the third floor of the Hartzler Library. They will work with you to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. All information and documentation is treated confidentially. See [http://www.emu.edu/academics/access/](http://www.emu.edu/academics/access/) for more information.

**Class Attendance:**

Students are expected to attend all class meetings. If unusual or emergency circumstances prevent class attendance, the student should notify the professor in advance if possible. Multiple absences from class will result in lower grades. The student is responsible for the material presented in classes missed (from EMU Graduate Catalog). Students should be aware of the importance of regular class attendance, particularly in the case of CJP classes that only meet once a week or over several weekends. Being absent for more than one class leads to a student missing a large portion of the class content. In addition to consistent class attendance, students should make every effort to arrive to class on time out of respect for the learning process, fellow students and faculty.
Course Extensions and Outstanding Grades:
For fall and spring semesters, all coursework is due by the end of the semester. If a student will not be able to complete a course on time, the student must submit a request one week before the end of the semester for an extension (up to 6 months), by emailing the instructor, academic advisor and the Academic Program Coordinator. If the request is granted the student will receive an "I" (incomplete) for the course which will later be replaced by a final grade when the work has been turned in on the agreed upon date. If the request for an extension is denied, the student will receive a grade for the work that has been completed up until the time the course was expected to have been completed. If no work has been submitted, the final grade will be an F (or W under unusual circumstances and with permission of the Program Director). Extensions will be given only for legitimate and unusual situations. Extensions are contracted by the student with the program for up to a maximum of 6 months after the deadline for the course work.

PLEASE NOTE: If the outstanding course work is received within the first 6 weeks of the extension, no grade reduction will be imposed; after 6 weeks any outstanding coursework will be reduced by ½ letter grade. If the extension deadline is not met, the student will receive a final grade based on the work completed.

Title IX:
The following policy applies to any incidents that occur (on or off campus) while you are a student registered at EMU. It does not apply if you are talking about incidents that happened prior your enrollment at EMU. It is important for you to know that all faculty and staff members are required to report known or alleged incidents of sexual violence (including sexual assault, domestic/relationship violence, stalking). That means that faculty and staff members cannot keep information about sexual violence confidential if you share that information with them. For example, if you inform a faculty or staff member of an issue of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination he/she will keep the information as private as he/she can, but is required to bring it to the attention of the institution's Title IX Coordinator. If you would like to talk to this office directly, Marcy Engle, Title IX Coordinator, can be reached at 540-432-4148 or marcy.engle@emu.edu. Additionally, you can also report incidents or complaints through the online portal at http://emu.edu/safecampus/. You may report, confidentially, incidents of sexual violence if you speak to Counseling Services counselors, Campus Ministries' pastors, or Health Services personnel providing clinical care. These individuals, as well as the Title IX Coordinator, can provide you with information on both internal and external support resources. Please refer to the Student Handbook which can be found at http://emu.edu/graduate-and-professional-studies/graduate-student-handbook.pdf for additional policies, information, and resources available to you.

Academic Program Policies: For more CJP-specific graduate program policies, please see http://www.emu.edu/cjp/grad/policies/. For EMU graduate program policies see http://www.emu.edu/catalog/graduate/graduate-professional-policies.pdf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A excellent</th>
<th>B adequate expectations</th>
<th>C below expectations</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Content** (quality of the information, ideas and supporting details) | • shows clarity of purpose  
• offers depth of content  
• applies insight and represents original thinking  
• follows guidelines for content | • shows some clarity of purpose  
• offers some depth of content  
• applies some insight and some original thinking  
• mostly follows guidelines for content | • shows minimal clarity of purpose  
• offers minimal depth of content or incorrect content  
• applies minimal insight and original thinking  
• does not follow guidelines for content |  |
| **Structure** (logical order or sequence of the writing) | • shows coherence and logically-developed paragraphs  
• uses very effective transitions between ideas and sections  
• constructs appropriate introduction and conclusion | • shows some coherence and some logically-developed paragraphs  
• uses some effective transitions between ideas & sections  
• shows some construction of appropriate introduction and conclusion | • shows minimal coherence and logically-developed paragraphs  
• uses minimal transitions between ideas and sections  
• shows minimal construction of appropriate introduction and conclusion |  |
| **Rhetoric and Style** (appropriate attention to audience) | • is concise, eloquent and rhetorically effective  
• effectively uses correct, varied and concise sentence structure  
• is engaging to read  
• writes appropriately for audience and purpose | • is somewhat concise, eloquent, and rhetorically effective  
• generally uses correct, varied, and concise sentence structure  
• is somewhat engaging to read  
• generally writes appropriately for audience and purpose | • shows minimal conciseness, eloquence, and rhetorical effectiveness  
• uses incorrect, monotonous or simplistic sentence structure  
• is not engaging to read  
• lacks appropriate writing for audience and purpose  
• uses inappropriate jargon and clichés |  |
| **Information Literacy** (locating, evaluating, and using effectively the needed information as appropriate to assignment) | • uses academic and reliable sources  
• chooses sources from many types of resources  
• chooses timely resources for the topic  
• integrates references and quotations to support ideas fully | • uses mostly academic and reliable sources  
• chooses sources from a moderate variety of types of resources  
• chooses resources with mostly appropriate dates  
• integrates references and quotations to provide some support for ideas | • lacks academic and reliable sources  
• chooses sources from a few types of resources  
• chooses a few sources with inappropriate dates  
• integrates references or quotations that are loosely linked to the ideas of the paper |  |
| **Source Integrity** (appropriate acknowledgment of sources used in research) | • correctly cites sources for all quotations  
• cites paraphrases correctly and credibly  
• includes reference page  
• makes virtually no errors in formatting  
• incorporates feedback given in previous written assignments | • correctly cites sources for most quotations  
• usually cites paraphrases correctly and credibly  
• includes reference page with some errors  
• makes some errors in documentation style  
• makes some errors in formatting  
• incorporates some feedback given in previous written assignments | • provides minimal sources for quotations  
• sometimes cites paraphrases correctly and credibly,  
• includes reference page with many errors  
• makes many errors in documentation style  
• makes many errors in formatting  
• lacks incorporation of feedback given in previous written assignments |  |
| **Conventions** (adherence to grammar rules: usage, spelling & mechanics of Standard Edited English or SEE) | • makes virtually no errors in SEE conventions  
• makes accurate word choices | • makes some errors SEE conventions  
• almost always makes accurate word choices | • makes many errors in SEE conventions  
• makes many inaccurate word choices |  |

The weighting of each of the six areas is dependent on the specific written assignment and the teacher’s preference. Plagiarism occurs when one presents as one’s own “someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source” (adapted from Council of Writing Program Administrators).
### Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>A – Excellent</th>
<th>B – Minimal expectations</th>
<th>C – Below expectations</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals &amp; Audience</td>
<td>-audience &amp; goals/learning objectives clearly identified. -project appropriate for, and likely to meet, its goals -project is appropriate for specified audience -project understandable to &amp; likely to engage and/or communicate to audience</td>
<td>-audience and goals identified though not as clearly as they could be -project may meet its goals but this is not entirely clear -project is at least somewhat appropriate for, and likely to communicate to audience.</td>
<td>-audience and goals inappropriate or inadequately identified -project unlikely to meet its goals and/or communicate to the audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>-project incorporates inquiry methods required by the assignment -all methodologies &amp; technologies have been appropriately used, with attention to ethical and methodological issues -if intended as intervention or advocacy, project has given adequate thought to implementation -sources &amp; methods are adequately identified</td>
<td>-methodology basically appropriate to the project and appropriately used, but could be strengthened -sources and methods identified but not as fully as they could be -more thought should be given to implementation issues</td>
<td>-methodology inadequate and/or inadequately articulated. -sources not appropriately identified -inadequate attention to implementation issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>-evidence of critical thinking about methods, sources, information and analysis or editing. -uses analysis/editing methods appropriate for the project -method of analysis or editing is adequately articulated</td>
<td>-some evidence of critical thinking but could be stronger -analytical approach and the analysis itself is basically appropriate but could be stronger and/or articulated better.</td>
<td>-inadequate evidence of critical thinking -analysis lacking or inadequate -analytic approach inappropriate or inadequately specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft &amp; Coherence</td>
<td>-level of craft is clearly adequate for the audience &amp; to meet project goals (whether or not it meets “artistic” standards) -project is coherent &amp; likely to resonate</td>
<td>-level of craft is minimally adequate for the audience and goals -project coherence could be stronger</td>
<td>-level of craft inadequate for purposes and/or audience -project is not coherent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects

**Background notes:**

- Arts approaches can be used in several different stages of a project:
  1. To gain or create knowledge. (For example, research “subjects” or participants might be engaged in an arts-based project as a way of soliciting information or encouraging insight.)
  2. To add complexity or nuance to created knowledge. (For example, an arts practice may serve as one method in a multi-method research project, creating an integrated, reflective methodology for the project. Alternatively, an arts practice could be used to analyze and/or interpret data collected by conventional methods.)
  3. To test knowledge. (For example, researchers might verify their interpretation of findings from a more traditional research process by creating a play or exhibit and testing it for resonance with their subjects.)
  4. To share findings. (For example, a play or exhibit might be created to (re)-present data collected or analyzed via conventional methods in order to impart the particular kinds of meaning the researcher considers important, and as a way to reach and engage a broader audience.)
  5. As a form of intervention. (For example, a project might be designed to raise awareness of an issue or conflict, to promote dialogue on a contested issue, or to advocate for a cause.)

- Arts-based products often do not specify methodologies used. Thus it may be important for a project to be accompanied by a short paper discussing analysis, theory of change, audience, goals, and methods used.

- Patricia Leavy, in “Method Meets Art: Arts-based Research Practice” (New York: Guilford Press) 2009, argues that “[t]raditional conceptions of validity and reliability, which developed out of positivism, are inappropriate for evaluating artistic inquiry.” (p. 15). She suggests that authenticity, trustworthiness, and validity can be assessed through attention to such elements as aesthetics, resonance, and vigor.

- For a discussion of standards, see “Method Meets Art” (Leavy, 2009: 15ff and Chapter 8).