

**Advocacy in Public Administration: Policy, Planning & Development 658 (PPD 658)**  
*A Graduate Seminar in Legislative Advocacy*

**MODIFIED**

**University of Southern California**, Price School of Public Policy, State Capital Center  
1800 I Street, Sacramento, California

**Professor:** Dr. Matthew Wheeler, Adjunct Associate Professor

Contact information:

Email – [mwheeler@usc.edu](mailto:mwheeler@usc.edu)

Office Phone – 916-442-3245

**Course Dates:** Please note that this course has been moved from an in-person offering, to a full online offering due to ensuing concerns with the COVID-19 virus. Faculty will work with students to ensure their success given the changes that have been required to successfully host the course.

**Summary:** This course is designed to give students a working knowledge of the legislative practice, specifically at the state level. The cumulative assignments within the course are designed to provide a tangible project, or “bill binder,” that can be used to stimulate and further a student’s career in the applicable advocacy professions. Areas of interest that parallel your current professional endeavors are highly encouraged to be integrated into the course assignments. The course website is on Blackboard. ([blackboard.usc.edu](http://blackboard.usc.edu))

**Course Objectives:** At the end of this course, successful students will have acquired the following skills and knowledge:

1. A working knowledge of the processes for adopting legislation in the California State Legislature and in the United States Congress. This working knowledge will entail all of the following:
  - a. Ability to track legislation at both levels.
  - b. Basic analytical skills for understanding and analyzing legislative proposals.
  - c. Skills to discover other sources of legislative information enabling students to complete independent research on legislative issues.
  - d. A working knowledge of the legislative process in Sacramento and Washington.
  - e. An understanding of the informal processes of legislating.
2. A working knowledge of the skills and techniques in negotiating a public policy issue.
3. Practical knowledge as to how interest groups and grassroots coalitions work both independently and in common practice.
4. An understanding of the principles established in the *Federalist Papers* on essential organizations, institutions, and civic engagement.

5. New perspectives on the influences that affect the legislative process.

**Academic Accommodations:** Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30am-5:00pm, Monday through Friday. The phone number is 213-740-0776.

**Required Texts:**

You are required to purchase and fully complete the readings, as assigned, each week. The publication date for each does not matter, so choose the most cost-effective option for each. Some may be available electronically, which is also acceptable.

CHETKOVICH, C. A., & KUNREUTHER, F. (2006). *From the ground up: grassroots organizations making social change*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press.

HOLYOKE, Thomas T. (2019). *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*. S.1.: Routledge.

JAY, J., MADISON, J., HAMILTON, A., & Dershowitz, A. M. (2019). *The Federalist papers*. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.

Additional readings and articles are included on Blackboard as part of your weekly readings. All required articles are available online with a supplied link.

Additionally, you are required to have copies of the **California State Constitution**, and the **United States Constitution** at your disposal for course discussions and live sessions. Complimentary copies of both Constitutions are readily available in legislative offices and online.

**Supplemental Readings & Reference Materials:**

Please see Appendix I of this syllabus for a listing of additional suggested (not required) readings and references to assist with your research.

**Suggested Background:** This course will be adapted as we meet based upon the backgrounds, skillsets and interests of the class. Each live session will include a brief discussion of “hot topics” and news and discuss through the lens of legislative advocacy. Reading the morning newspaper, political blogs, or even Facebook will help students start class with a stimulated discussion.

**Technology & Adobe Connect:** This course was originally composed as an in-class offering, which has received favorable reviews for nearly a decade. Faculty has worked hard to move this course to an online offering while preserving as much of the overall course experience as possible. Please make sure that your computer and software are up

to date and that you are able to access Adobe Connect for all weekly and core live sessions. You will need to download a plug-in from Adobe to attend class if you have not previously used Adobe Connect.

Here is a link to our Adobe Connect room: <http://uscprice.adobeconnect.com/ppd658/>. We will use this room for every meeting.

**Course Schedule:** Due to the need to move this course from an in-person to an online offering, changes to the schedule became necessary.

**Weekly Live Sessions:** For select weeks in-between our longer online sessions, we will hold Monday night lectures. Students can expect to receive core lectures aligned with course readings, and curriculum, hear from guest speakers, and share individual presentations. These weekly sessions will be no more than two-hours and have been scheduled to accommodate working professionals. **These weekly live sessions are mandatory and will be held via Adobe Connect.** *There is a make-up option available for those unable to attend a weekly live session.* All weekly live sessions will be held from 6:00 – 8:00pm, Pacific on May 18, June 1, June 8, June 29, July 6, July 27 & August 3.

**Weekly Live Session Make-up Option:** It is understood that many students are working professionals and given our change in schedule, accommodations must be made to ensure student success. All seven weekly live sessions are mandatory, however; if a student needs to miss a live session, they may view the session's recording and email a summary, of no less than 350 words, within 10 days of the missed session. Summaries may be emailed to the professor at [mwheeler@usc.edu](mailto:mwheeler@usc.edu) and are expected to be strong submissions of high academic quality. Make-up assignments may not be used in lieu of attending live sessions and are extended as a courtesy to busy professional students. Please do not take advantage of this offering.

**Core Live Sessions:** We will meet as a class for an extended time over the two weekends that the course was originally scheduled. The course schedule has been slightly modified to accommodate working professionals. **These core live sessions are mandatory, cannot be made up, and will be held via Adobe Connect.** The core live session schedule will be:

Friday, June 19, 2020: 8:00am – 11:00am

Saturday, June 20, 2020: 8:00am – 11:00am

Saturday, July 18, 2020: 8:00am – 11:00am

Saturday, July 18, 2020: 1:00 – 5:00pm (As groups outside of class)

Sunday, July 19, 2020: 8:00am – 11:00am

## COURSE SCHEDULE & DELIVERABLES

### Week One (May 20-26, 2020)

#### *Introduction to Advocacy*

#### Readings:

BORIS, E., & MARONICK, M. (2012). [Civic Participation and Advocacy](#). In Salamon L. (Ed.), *The State of Nonprofit America* (pp. 394-422). Brookings Institution Press. Retrieved March 19, 2019, from [www.jstor.org/stable/10.7864/j.ctt1xx6fn.13](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7864/j.ctt1xx6fn.13)

CHETKOVICH, C. A., & KUNREUTHER, F. (2006). *From the ground up: grassroots organizations making social change*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press. Pages 1-12

HOLYOKE, Thomas T. (2019). *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*. S.1.: Routledge. Pages 1-34

#### Course Time:

##### [Weekly Live Session I](#)

Monday, May 18, 2020: 6:00 – 8:00pm

#### Assignments Due:

**Discussion Board:** *Introductions & Street Creds*

### Week Two (May 27-June 2, 2020)

#### *Foundations of Public Policy Development & Engagement*

#### Readings:

CHETKOVICH, C. A., & KUNREUTHER, F. (2006). *From the ground up: grassroots organizations making social change*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press. Pages 12-27

JAY, J., MADISON, J., HAMILTON, A., & Dershowitz, A. M. (2019). *The Federalist papers*. New York: Skyhorse Publishing. *Federalist 47 & Federalist 14*

#### Instructional Materials:

**Video:** *Foundations of Contemporary Governance Systems*

#### Course Time:

##### [Weekly Live Session II](#)

Monday, June 1, 2020: 6:00 – 8:00pm

**Assignments Due:**

**Discussion Board:** *Foundational theories for practitioners*

**Week Three (June 3-9, 2020)**

*Process, Institutions & Organizations*

**Readings:**

HOLYOKE, Thomas T. (2019). *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*. S.1.: Routledge.  
Pages 133-186

JAY, J., MADISON, J., HAMILTON, A., & Dershowitz, A. M. (2019). *The Federalist papers*.  
New York: Skyhorse Publishing.  
*Federalist 46, Federalist 51, Federalist 52 & Federalist 68*

**Instructional Materials:**

**Video:** *Organizations, Systems & Institutions*

**Course Time:**

**Weekly Live Session III**

Monday, June 8, 2020: 6:00 – 8:00pm

**Assignments Due:**

**Paper:** Legislative Proposal Letter Due: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 @ 11:30pm

**Week Four (June 10-16, 2020)**

*Drafting legislation and the role of Legislative Counsel*

**Readings:**

CHETKOVICH, C. A., & KUNREUTHER, F. (2006). *From the ground up: grassroots organizations making social change*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press.  
Pages 12-81

JAY, J., MADISON, J., HAMILTON, A., & Dershowitz, A. M. (2019). *The Federalist papers*.  
New York: Skyhorse Publishing.  
*Federalist 39 & Federalist 47*

LEE, F. (1929). [The Office of the Legislative Counsel](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1112986). *Columbia Law Review*, 29(4), 381-403. [www.jstor.org/stable/1112986](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1112986)

SHOBE, J. (2014). [Intertemporal Statutory Interpretation and the evolution of Legislative Drafting](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23723306). *Columbia Law Review*, 114(4), 807-877. Retrieved April 24, 2020, from [www.jstor.org/stable/23723306](http://www.jstor.org/stable/23723306)

**Instructional Materials:**

**Video:** *Understanding the California State Legislature*

**Course Time:**

**No Live Session this week**

**Assignments Due:**

**Paper:** Mock-up/Draft Legislation Due: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 @ 11:30pm

**Week Five (June 17-23, 2020)**

*Methods, deadlines, theories, players*

**Readings:**

CHETKOVICH, C. A., & KUNREUTHER, F. (2006). *From the ground up: grassroots organizations making social change*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press.  
Pages 83-110

JAY, J., MADISON, J., HAMILTON, A., & Dershowitz, A. M. (2019). *The Federalist papers*.  
New York: Skyhorse Publishing.  
*Federalist 39*

**Course Time:**

**Core Live Session I**

Friday, June 19, 2020: 8:00am – 11:00am

**Core Live Session II**

Saturday, June 20, 2020: 8:00am – 11:00am

**Week Six (June 24-30, 2020)**

*Direct v. Indirect Democracies*

**Readings:**

JAY, J., MADISON, J., HAMILTON, A., & Dershowitz, A. M. (2019). *The Federalist papers*.  
New York: Skyhorse Publishing.  
*Federalist 9 & Federalist 10*

**Instructional Materials:**

**Video:** *Direct v. Indirect Democracies*

**Course Time:**

**Weekly Live Session IV**

Monday, June 29, 2020: 6:00 – 8:00pm

**Assignments Due:**

**Discussion Board:** *Direct democracy in practice*

**Week Seven (July 1-7, 2020)**

*Advocates, Lobbyists, & everything in-between*

**Readings:**

CHETKOVICH, C. A., & KUNREUTHER, F. (2006). *From the ground up: grassroots organizations making social change*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press. Pages 111-131

HOLYOKE, Thomas T. (2019). *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*. S.1.: Routledge. Pages 87-108

**Instructional Materials:**

**Video:** *Advocate v. Lobbyist*

**Course Time:**

**Weekly Live Session V**

Monday, July 6, 2020: 6:00 – 8:00pm

**Assignments Due:**

**Discussion Board:** *Voices heard; the day in the life of a committee hearing*

**Week Eight (July 8-14, 2020)**

*Stakeholders & Grassroots Development*

**Readings:**

CHETKOVICH, C. A., & KUNREUTHER, F. (2006). *From the ground up: grassroots organizations making social change*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press. Pages 132-148

HOLYOKE, Thomas T. (2019). *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*. S.1.: Routledge. Pages 35-86

**Course Time:**

**No Live Session this week**

**Assignments Due:**

**Paper:** *Committee Analysis Due Tuesday, July 14 @ 11:30pm*

## **Week Nine (July 15-21, 2020)**

### *Advocacy in Practice*

#### **Readings:**

HOLYOKE, Thomas T. (2019). *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*. S.1.: Routledge.

Pages 133-186 (Revisit)

#### **Course Time:**

##### **Core Live Session III**

Saturday, July 18, 2020: 8:00am – 11:00am

##### **Group Study: 1:00 – 5:00pm**

In-class advocacy peer review

##### **Core Live Session IV**

Sunday, July 19, 2020: 8:00am – 11:00am

#### **Assignments Due:**

**Presentation:** Advocacy Presentations Due Saturday, July 18 @ 8:00am

**Paper:** Advocacy Peer Review Assignment Due Sunday, July 19 @ 8:00am

## **Week Ten (July 22-28, 2020)**

### *Social Change & Coalition Building*

#### **Readings:**

CHETKOVICH, C. A., & KUNREUTHER, F. (2006). *From the ground up: grassroots organizations making social change*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press.

Pages 149-177

HOLYOKE, Thomas T. (2019). *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*. S.1.: Routledge.

Pages 213-238

SLOAN, P. (2009). [Redefining Stakeholder Engagement: From Control to Collaboration](#). *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*,(36), 25-40. Retrieved April 24, 2020, from [www.jstor.org/stable/jcorpciti.36.25](http://www.jstor.org/stable/jcorpciti.36.25)

#### **Course Time:**

##### **Weekly Live Session VI**

Monday, July 27, 2020: 6:00 – 8:00pm

#### **Assignments Due:**

**Discussion Board:** *Representation, factions and policymaking*



## **Week Eleven (July 29-August 4, 2020)**

### *Navigation & Strategy*

#### **Readings:**

HOLYOKE, Thomas T. (2019). *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*. S.1.: Routledge.  
Pages 109-132

LAPIRA, T., & THOMAS, H. (2017). [Reassessing Lobbying Regulation in Washington](#). In *Revolving Door Lobbying: Public Service, Private Influence, and the Unequal Representation of Interests* (pp. 181-201). Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas. Retrieved April 24, 2020, from [www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1qft06g.12](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1qft06g.12)

#### **Instructional Materials:**

**Video:** *Decision-Making, Bounded Rationality & Incrementalism*

#### **Course Time:**

**Weekly Live Session VII**

Monday, August 3, 2020: 6:00 – 8:00pm

#### **Assignments Due:**

**Paper:** Legislative Strategy Outline Due Tuesday, August 4 @ 11:30pm

## **Week Twelve (August 5-11, 2020)**

### *Ethical Considerations & the Modern Advocate*

#### **Readings:**

BAUER, T. (2014). [Responsible Lobbying: A Multidimensional Model](#). *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, (53), 61-76. Retrieved April 24, 2020, from [www.jstor.org/stable/jcorpciti.53.61](http://www.jstor.org/stable/jcorpciti.53.61)

HOLYOKE, Thomas T. (2019). *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*. S.1.: Routledge.  
Pages 269-284

#### **Course Time:**

**No Live Session this week**

#### **Assignments Due:**

**Paper:** Personal Engagement Reflection Due Tuesday, August 11 @ 11:30pm

## **ASSIGNMENTS**

### **LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY & PROCESS SIMULATION**

**SUMMARY:** As students of public policy and advocacy, there is an expectation that you be able to articulate your thoughts orally, as well as in a written format. This course-long cumulative simulation is designed to highlight the policy making process from thought inception to implementation. In order to successfully complete this course, **ALL ASSIGNMENTS MUST BE TURNED IN ON TIME – NO EXCEPTIONS.** This simulation is progressive; therefore, if preceding assignments have not been completed, moving on to the next steps is not possible. At the end of class, you leave with a complete “bill binder” that show your knowledge and expertise of the process. Please note, some assignments are individual, while others are group/team assignments.

**SIMULATION:** In teams of two (one team of three will be permitted if there is an odd-number of students enrolled in the course), you will choose a specific public policy that you wish to change through the legislative process. As a team, as well as individually, you will research, propose and lobby your legislative proposal to your peers. In the final core live session of class, your bill will either be signed into California State Law, or vetoed by the “Governor.” Your final course assignment will be based upon the Governor’s decision.

**MECHANICS:** All assignments are expected to be emailed to the professor at [mwheeler@usc.edu](mailto:mwheeler@usc.edu) on time. Creativity is encouraged; however, do not dismiss the parameters of each assignment. Please follow the directions for each assignment with regards to length and grading criteria. Please use either a Times New Roman, Ariel or Cambria font, no greater than 12-point. All papers are expected to be double-spaced (or its equivalent with regards to length) with one-inch margins on all sides. Please ensure that you follow proper APA format, as appropriate, and include all references cited.

#### **ASSIGNMENTS**

##### **1. Discussion Boards (5 Total)**

**Due Date(s):** Saturday, Sunday and Tuesday of Weeks One, Two, Six, Seven & Ten

**Value:** 10% of course grade

**Summary:** As an online course, it is important to interact with your peers and build community surrounding presented topics. A discussion prompt will be assigned and it is up to the student to respond to the prompt. Although discussion boards ensue a conversational tone, proper grammar, mechanics, references and academically suitable formats are required for your responses.

**Assignment:** By Day Four (Saturday), you will respond to the initial discussion board prompt as an individual assignment in no less than 250 words (not including references). By Day Five (Sunday), you will pose questions and comments of no less than 150 words (not including references) to no less than two of your classmates. By Day Seven (Tuesday), you must reply to all questions and comments posed to you.

## 2. Legislative Proposal Letter

**Due Date:** Tuesday, June 9 @ 11:30pm

**Value:** 5% of course grade

**Summary:** As we begin the legislative simulation process, give thought to an area of public policy that you wish to change. Be creative, and think of contemporary issues that are affecting states and their respective legislatures. During a live session, we discuss your proposal as a class and strategize as to the next steps. If you are unsure of what area you wish to concentrate, do not worry, as we can work on this together in class.

**Assignment:** In your team of two (one paper for you both), compose an original 3-4 page legislative proposal to a sitting or former member of a state legislature or Legislative Counsel. Be sure to include whom you represent (organization), why you have a vested interest in proposing the legislation, and why you think this member would benefit from authoring the legislation. Be creative. Assignment will be evaluated based upon your persuasiveness, detail, organization, and overall strategy.

**Submission:** Please submit your letter through TurnItIn within our course Blackboard page.

## 3. Mock-up/Draft Legislation

**Due Date:** Tuesday, June 16 @ 11:30pm

**Value:** 10% of course grade

**Summary:** Now that you have proposed your bill to the author, you need to assist Legislative Counsel in drafting your bill language. Through group research you will study current state law and “mock-up” what needs to be changed in order to implement your proposal. As an example, if you were proposing to allow California State Universities to confer doctoral degrees, you would most likely change the Education Code.

**Assignment:** Clearly research state law and find the areas that need additions or omissions in order to implement your bill. As a team, propose language to current law through strikethroughs and italicized new language to provide a “mock-up” of your bill language (one “mock up” per team).

**Submission:** Please submit your draft legislation through TurnItIn within our course Blackboard page.

## 4. Committee Analysis

**Due Date:** Tuesday, July 14 @ 11:30pm

**Value:** 20% of course grade

**Summary:** In the interim between core live sessions, your bill has been assigned to a legislative committee with policy oversight. For example, if you were proposing to allow all citizens in California to carry firearms, your bill would most likely be sent to the Committee on Public Safety. As the consultant to the committee, you will analyze the proposed legislation and provide applicable background and findings.

**Assignment:** This is an individual assignment; therefore, every student is expected to submit a separate paper. In no less than eight pages, prepare a committee analysis of your proposed bill from the perspective of the assigned committee. Be

sure to include previous legislation that covered your issue, current legislation, an author's summary of the need for the legislation, and organizations who have registered support or opposition. You will be graded upon your expertise, research on previous and current legislation, and overall creativity in completing the assignment. Do not forget to include applicable citations and references. Examples of committee analyses will be provided in class. You are welcome to work with your team on your research and analysis, but every student is expected to submit an individual paper.

**Submission:** Please submit your analysis through TurnItIn within our course Blackboard page.

## 5. Advocacy Presentations

**Due Date:** Saturday, July 18 @ 8:00am

**Value:** 20% of course grade

**Summary:** Based upon your committee analysis, you now must present your bill and findings to the legislative committee and convince the members to support, or oppose, your legislation. One member of the team will provide a supporting argument, while one member of the team will provide an opposition argument. Your classmates will act as members of the committee and choose to either move your bill forward, suggest amendments, or hold your bill in committee.

**Assignment:** Prepare a VoiceThread presentation, using both video and audio, to present the support and opposition sides of your policy. Presentations should be approximately 12-15 minutes in length and will be viewed by your colleagues in the Group Study session of class on Saturday, July 18 from 1:00 – 5:00pm. You will be graded upon your persuasiveness, advance preparation, knowledge of the issue area, creativity, and ability to simulate a realistic situation.

**Submission:** Please email your VoiceThread presentation links to [mwheeler@usc.edu](mailto:mwheeler@usc.edu) by the date due and do not forget to set your presentations to public. No late submissions will be accepted due to the quick turnaround necessary for peer review.

## 6. Peer Review of Advocacy Presentations

**Due Date:** Sunday, July 19 @ 8:00am

**Value:** 5% of course grade

**Summary & Assignment:** On the afternoon of Saturday, July 18, you will be assigned a series of presentations to view with your team. Based upon your feedback, a recommendation of pass, suggested amendments or failure will be made to the professor.

**Submission:** By 8:00am on Sunday, July 19, please email [mwheeler@usc.edu](mailto:mwheeler@usc.edu) with your group positions. Your positions are expected to be substantive (approx 350 words per presentation), of high academic quality, and to include rationale for your position.

## 7. Legislative Strategy Outline

**Due Date:** Tuesday, August 4 @ 11:30pm

**Value:** 20% of course grade

**Summary:** Based upon your advocacy presentations and completed assignments, the “Governor” will choose to sign your bill into law, or veto. From this outcome, you must provide a strategy for the next steps.

**Assignment:** This is an individual assignment; therefore, every student is expected to submit a separate paper. In no less than eight pages, provide a strategy relative to your bill and what its next steps may be. Make the membership or organizational leadership your audience, and provide a policy memo to them based upon the outcome of your bill. If your bill was signed into law, how do you propose implementing your public policy? What will the public’s reception be? What steps will your opposition now take to possibly overturn your policy? If your bill was vetoed, why did it fail? What steps could have been taken to ensure its success? How will you address these steps in the future? How can you defend yourself as the advocate tasked with the bill’s success? Remember: the audience of this memo is the organization that has hired you, so be persuasive, as well as realistic. You will be graded upon your ability to articulate the overall process that your bill underwent, future strategies, and subject matter knowledge in terms of the specific bill. Applicable citations and references should be included.

**Submission:** Please submit your analysis through TurnItIn within our course Blackboard page.

## 8. Personal Engagement Reflection

**Value:** 5% of course grade

**Assignment:** We are all advocates, and as we have discussed, advocacy is a highly reflective process. Although we do not often take the time to contemplate where we have been, it is important to reflect in an effort to achieve greater outcomes. In no less than one-page, and no more than three, discuss your personal role as an advocate. What have you learned from PPD 658 that will enable you to engage your stakeholders, communities, and decision-makers to a greater degree and achieve desired results? How have you grown as an advocate, and what will you no longer seek to do as a counterintuitive strategy? Personal reflection is highly encouraged and all submissions will be confidential.

**Submission:** Please submit your reflection through TurnItIn within our course Blackboard page.

## 9. Participation

**Summary:** Attendance and engagement in weekly and core live sessions, in attention to overall commitment to the course.

**Value:** 5% of course grade

**Assignment:** As a Graduate Student, you are expected to be thoughtful and engaging throughout the entire class. Further, as a student of legislative advocacy, participation is critical for the successful completion of this course. There is no need to “overdo” it, but it is expected that all students will show up to all weekly and core live sessions, on time, and participate in all assignments. The Professor holds the SOLE right to detract participation points at any time due to tardiness in and out of the Adobe Connect room, incomplete assignments, and lack of overall thoughtful

participation. Demonstrated knowledge of the course texts and readings will also be a factor of course participation.

### EVALUATION & GRADING

Including the above detailed assignments. Students will be graded individually on all assignments, including on group assignments based upon individual contributions, documented effort and impact.

Assignment	Points	% of Grade
Discussion Boards (5 @ 20 points each)	100	10
Legislative Proposal Letter	50	5
Mock-up/Draft Legislation	100	10
Committee Analysis	200	20
Advocacy Presentation	200	20
Advocacy Peer Review	50	5
Legislative Strategy Outline	200	20
Personal Engagement Reflection	50	5
Participation	50	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>100</b>

### GRADING SCALE

Course final grades will be determined using the following scale:

Letter Grade	Points	Percentage
A	930 & Above	93% & Above
A-	900-929	90-92.99%
B+	870-899	87-89.99%
B	830-869	83-86.99%
B-	800-829	80-82.99%
C+	770-799	77-79.99%
C	730-766	73-76.66%
C-	700-729	70-72.99%
D+	670-699	67-69.99%
D	630-669	63-66.99%
D-	600-629	60-62.99%
F	599 & Below	59.99% & Below
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>100%</b>

## COURSE RUBRICS

<b>Individual Assignments Rubric</b> (Legislative Proposal Letter, Mock-up Legislation, Advocacy Peer Review, & Personal Engagement Reflection)				
Objective/Criteria	Insufficient	Partially Proficient	Proficient	Superior
Quality of research and evidence ___/10 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	There is partial success in applying research; may be biased or over-reliant on sources such as popular news or advocacy sources. (4)	There is reasoned application of client-oriented research to the topic; some sources may be unreliable or irrelevant. (7)	Excellent in integrating and applying high-quality, project-oriented research to the topic of the assignment. (10)
Quality of analysis ___/15 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	Rudimentary application of skills and frameworks that partially address the purpose of the assignment. (7)	Uses skills and frameworks to address purpose of the assignment, but some depth of analysis or logical gaps are evident. (12)	A very high-quality analysis that uses skills and frameworks learned in the program to address the purpose of the assignment. (15)
Presentation mechanics and style ___/15 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	Multiple errors or patterns of error; too rhetorical or conversational a style. (7)	Some errors present, or style or syntax is faulty; professional style needs polish. (12)	A clean product with no errors and a highly professional, neutral writing / presentation styles. (15)
Sequencing of argument ___/10 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	Poor transitions; inconsistencies in coherence; may lack executive summary. (4)	Organized but may have minor lapses; transitions evident; usually has clear focus; poor executive summary. (7)	Briefing is organized within paragraphs and across sections to support argument. Submission creatively fulfills guidelines. (10)

### **Research & Analysis Assignments Rubric** (Committee Analysis & Legislative Strategy Outline)

<b>Objective/Criteria</b>	<b>Insufficient</b>	<b>Partially Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Superior</b>
Quality of research and evidence ___/40 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	There is partial success in applying research; may be biased or over-reliant on sources such as popular news or advocacy sources. (20)	There is reasoned application of client-oriented research to the topic; some sources may be unreliable or irrelevant. (30)	Excellent in integrating and applying high-quality, project-oriented research to the topic of the assignment. (40)
Quality of analysis ___/60 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	Rudimentary application of skills and frameworks that partially address the purpose of the assignment. (30)	Uses skills and frameworks to address purpose of the assignment, but some depth of analysis or logical gaps are evident. (50)	A very high-quality analysis that uses skills and frameworks learned in the program to address the purpose of the assignment. (60)
Presentation mechanics and style ___/60 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	Multiple errors or patterns of error; too rhetorical or conversational a style. (30)	Some errors present, or style or syntax is faulty; professional style needs polish. (50)	A clean product with no errors and a highly professional, neutral writing / presentation styles. (60)
Sequencing of argument ___/40 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	Poor transitions; inconsistencies in coherence; may lack executive summary. (20)	Organized but may have minor lapses; transitions evident; usually has clear focus; poor executive summary. (30)	Briefing is organized within paragraphs and across sections to support argument. Submission creatively fulfills guidelines. (40)

### **Presentation Rubric (Group)**

<b>Objective/Criteria</b>	<b>Insufficient</b>	<b>Partially Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Superior</b>
Quality of research and evidence ___/40 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	There is partial success in applying research; may be biased or over-reliant on sources such as popular news or advocacy sources. (20)	There is reasoned application of client-oriented research to the topic; some sources may be unreliable or irrelevant. (30)	Excellent in integrating and applying high-quality, project-oriented research to the topic of the assignment. (40)



Quality of analysis ___/60 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	Rudimentary application of skills and frameworks that partially address the purpose of the assignment. (30)	Uses skills and frameworks to address purpose of the assignment, but some depth of analysis or logical gaps are evident. (50)	A very high-quality analysis that uses skills and frameworks learned in the program to address the purpose of the assignment. (60)
Presentation mechanics and style ___/60 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	Multiple errors or patterns of error; too rhetorical or conversational a style. Little preparation evident. (30)	Some errors present, or style or syntax is faulty; professional style needs polish. (50)	A clean product and presentation with no errors and highly professional, neutral styles. (60)
Sequencing of argument ___/40 points	Submission does not meet minimal grading criteria. (0)	Poor transitions; inconsistencies in coherence; marginal presentation skills and styles. (20)	Organized but may have minor lapses; transitions evident; usually has clear focus; sufficient written work and presentation styles. (30)	Presentation and visuals are well organized with recognizable styles. Submission creatively fulfills guidelines. (40)

<b>Discussion Board Rubric</b>				
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Insufficient</b>	<b>Partially Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Superior</b>
Relevance, Application, Originality ___/4 points	Fails to address the question posed, non-serious or not contemplative response, lacks value-added information, thought patterns difficult to follow. (1)	Addresses the question, some relation to topic, inconsistencies in unity and / or coherence. (2)	Addresses the question, uses ideas from project research, adds some content, usually has clear focus. (3)	Addresses the question, uses ideas from project research, offers a unique perspective and clear focus, is fluent and cohesive. (4)
Insight, Observation, Analysis ___/3 points	No clear concept addressed, lacks clarity of ideas, minimal understanding of the assignment. (1)	Addresses concepts already highlighted, rudimentary development of ideas, some understanding of the assignment. (2)	Offers a concept worth thinking about, develops ideas, demonstrates understanding of assignment. (3)	Offers significant concept or idea worth thinking about, ideas developed in depth, shows clear understanding of the assignment. (4)

Details/Evidence ___/2 points	Details are random, inappropriate, or barely apparent. (0)	Details lack elaboration or are repetitive. (0)	Details are elaborated and pertinent to the course. (1)	Details are effective, explicit, and pertinent to the course. (2)
Grammar, usage, mechanics ___/1 point	Errors are frequent and severe. (0)	Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident. (0)	Some errors are present. (1)	Few, if any, errors are present. (1)

<b>Participation Rubric</b>			
<b>Objective/Criteria</b>	<b>Incomplete</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Superior</b>
Commitment to the course ___/30 points	Misses meetings or does not engage fully in project tasks and activities; does not participate fully in live sessions or meet all deadlines; reactive rather than proactive (10)	Reasonable level of activity and involvement in course tasks and activities; engages in team interactions and class live sessions; meets deadlines (20)	High level of activity and proactive involvement in course tasks and activities; constructive engagement in class interactions and live sessions; always meets deadlines. (30)
Intellectual contributions on point for this course ___/30 points	Provides some contributions that advance the understanding of class members and addresses the objectives of the course. (10)	Regularly contributes conceptual ideas that advance the goals and tasks of fellow students and advances the end objectives of the course. (20)	Provides particularly useful citations, research, and original ideas that make particularly insightful contributions to the understanding of fellow students and offers instructive contributions during the course. (30)
Professional teamwork and positive relationships ___/40 points	Communications in team meetings; live time; and other interactions absent or sometimes lacking professionalism or do not help keep class cohesive and working constructively. (10)	Communications and team interactions are mostly constructive and professional; listening skills are present; communications are always professional. (20)	Displays leadership in keeping teams cohesive and on task during group work. Communications and interactions in all meetings, live time, email, and other interactions are consistently constructive and highly professional. (40)

## **APPENDIX I** **Resources & References**

### **ONLINE RESOURCES** **Available on the internet or via website downloads**

#### *Alliance for Justice*

This national association of public interest advocacy organizations works to strengthen the capacity of the public interest community to influence public policy. See website, particularly the section: for-nonprofits-foundations <http://www.allianceforjustice.org/>

Center for Community Change. (1996). How and why – to influence Public Policy: An Action Guide for Community Organizations. *Community Change*. Issue 17: Winter 1996. <http://www.jointogether.org/resources/how-and-why-to-influence-an.html>

*OMB Watch*. This organization provides information on budget and government performance, regulatory and government accountability, nonprofit advocacy and more. See their website, particularly the Nonprofit Advocacy section, which has lots of useful information: <http://www.ombwatch.org>.

Real Clout Textbook: any part, but especially: Public Policy Making in the Administrative Branch <http://realclout.org/ppi/publications/RealCloutTextbook-v2.pdf>

Real Clout Tool Box, From the Public Policy Institute, Boston, MA. <http://realclout.org/ppi/activities/RealCloutToolbox.stm>

### **RESEARCH**

Community Toolbox. Chapter 31. Conducting Advocacy Research [http://ctb.ku.edu/tools/en/chapter\\_1031.htm](http://ctb.ku.edu/tools/en/chapter_1031.htm)

An interesting activist / research organization is The Applied Research Center. Their work exemplifies the power of research in advocacy. <http://www.arc.org>

Schaefer, S. National Association of Child Advocates. 2001. Understanding Research: Top Ten Tips for Advocates and Policy Makers. <http://www.voices.org/>

### **MEDIA/MESSAGE DEVELOPMENT**

National Council of Nonprofit Associations. PALS Promoting Advocacy and Leadership for the Sector. TOOLKIT, Summer 2004. Media Relations: How to Earn Press Coverage for Your Organization. <http://www.councilofnonprofits.org/?q=node/540>

Fenton Communications. *Now Hear This: The Nine Laws of Successful Advocacy*

Communications. [http://www.fenton.com/pages/5\\_resources/nowhearthis.htm](http://www.fenton.com/pages/5_resources/nowhearthis.htm). Their website's RESOURCES section has other interesting brief guides.

Connecticut Association of Nonprofits. (2003). *Advocacy and Lobbying Toolkit*; Section B: Public/Media Relations Tools and Resources.

[http://www.ctnonprofits.org/Pages/NonProfitResources/Advocacy\\_Lobbying\\_Toolkit\\_WordVersions.asp](http://www.ctnonprofits.org/Pages/NonProfitResources/Advocacy_Lobbying_Toolkit_WordVersions.asp)

Advocacy Institute. (1992). *Telling Your Story: A Guide to Preparing Advocacy Case Studies*. <http://advocacy.org/publications/pdf/tellingyourstory.pdf> This includes guidelines and examples.

FAIR (Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting) Media Activists Kit:

<http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=119> - more about how to ensure that the media reflects real facts; some advice on using media for advocacy.

Media Rights, a project of Arts Engine, Inc. which "supports, produces and distributes independent media of consequence and promotes the use of independent media by advocates, educators and the general public." Check out these tips on using film as an organizing vehicle:

[http://www.mediarights.org/news/2008/02/08/three\\_things\\_documentary\\_film\\_makers\\_can\\_learn\\_from\\_the\\_super\\_bowl](http://www.mediarights.org/news/2008/02/08/three_things_documentary_film_makers_can_learn_from_the_super_bowl)

## **ELECTRONIC ADVOCACY**

Internet tools for on-line advocacy including contacting lawmakers, utilizing data and more. Examples of products for electronic advocacy:

- <http://www.720strategies.com/>
- <http://www.capitoladvantage.com>
- <http://www.thedatabank.com/pubdw/products/advocacy.html>
- The National Alliance of Nonprofit Associations sponsors another vehicle: <http://givevoice.org/>

Policy Link: [Click Here for Change: Your Guide to the E-Advocacy Revolution. \(pdf\)](#)

Care2.org (formerly: *MOVING IDEAS NETWORK*, *The Electronic Policy Network*, a project of The American Prospect Magazine) simplifies complex policy ideas. See

<http://www.care2.com/causes/politics/> Check out their blog, and their Action Center. Their membership list provides instant connection to many organizational websites.

*The Virtual Activist, A Training Course by NetAction*, by Audrie Krause, Michael Stein, Children Now, and Judi Clark, Womens Work. [www.netaction.org/training](http://www.netaction.org/training)

OMB. Study Points To Improvements In Communication with Congress in Digital Age.

<http://www.ombwatch.org/article/articleview/2974/1/355> OMB Watcher Vol. 6: 2005 : August 8, 2005 Vol.6, No.16

MoveOn.Org has a variety of political campaigns. See their website and note how ideas are linked to action. <http://www.moveon.org/campaigns.html>. Also instructive are their Success Stories: [http://www.moveon.org/success\\_stories.html](http://www.moveon.org/success_stories.html)

<http://www.buildingmovement.org/>

Americans for the Arts – various projects, for example: Animating Democracy  
<http://www.americansforthearts.org/animatingdemocracy/>

Assorted online videos – search arts: <http://www.blinkx.com/>

Beehive Design Collectives: <http://www.beehivecollective.org/english/front.htm>

### **REFERENCE FOR SPECIAL TOPICS**

Byron E. Shafer, The Two Majorities and the Puzzle of Modern American Politics, Kansas University Press, 2003.

Barry C. Burden, editor, Uncertainty in American Politics, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Frank Newport, Polling Matters: Why Leaders Must Listen to the Wisdom of the People, Warner Books, 2004.

The Annenberg Democracy Project, A Republic Divided, Oxford University Press, 2007.

Iwan Morgan & Philip John Davies, Broken Government? American Politics in the Obama Era, Institute for the Study of the Americas, 2012.

Charles S. Bullock III & Mark J. Rozell, The New Politics of the Old South: An Introduction to Southern Politics, 5th edition, Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.

James A. Thurber & Antoine Yoshinaka, Editors, American Gridlock: The Sources, Character, and Impact of Political Polarization, Cambridge University Press, 2015.

David Goldfield, The Gifted Generation: When Government Was Good, Bloomsbury USA, 2017.

## **HOW LAWS ARE MADE**

David C. King, *Turf Wars: How Congressional Committees Claim Jurisdiction*, Chicago University Press, 1997.

Walter J. Oleszek, Mark J. Oleszek, Elizabeth Rybicki, & Bill Henif, Jr., *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*, 10th edition, CQ Press, 2015.

Lawrence C. Dodd & Bruce I. Oppenheimer, *Congress Reconsidered*, 11th Edition, CQ Press, 2017.

Barbara Sinclair, *Unorthodox Lawmaking: New Legislative Processes in the U.S. Congress*, 5th Edition, Sage/CQ Press, 2017.

Josh Chafetz, *Congress's Constitution: Legislative Authority and the Separation of Powers*, Yale University Press, 2017.

## **HOW INTERESTS ORGANIZE TO ADVOCATE**

H. R. Mahood, *Interest Group Politics in America: A New Intensity*, Prentice Hall, 1990.

S. Laurel Weldon, *When Protest Makes Policy: How Social Movements Represent Disadvantaged Groups*, University of Michigan Press, 2011.

Matt Grossman, *The Not-So-Special Interests: Interest Groups, Public Representation, and American Governance*, Stanford University Press, 2012

Hahrie Han, *How Organizations Develop Activists: Civic Associations and Leadership in the 21st Century*, Oxford University Press, 2014.

Mark Harvey, *Celebrity Influence: Politics, Persuasion, and Issue-Based Advocacy*, University of Kansas Press, 2017.

McGee Young, *Developing Interests: Organizational Change and the Politics of Advocacy*, University of Kansas Press, 2010.

Dara Z. Strolovitch, *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics*, University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Janelle Wong, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, Taeku Lee, & Janje Junn, *Asian American Political Participation: Emerging Constituents and Their Political Identities*, Russell Sage Foundation, 2011.

## **CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM**

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) including Federal Elections and Federal Election Commission, current. <http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text>

Fair Political Practices Commission. Political Reform Act as Amended. Sacramento, CA: State of California, 1995.

CRS Report, "Campaign Contribution Limits: Selected Questions About McCutcheon and Policy Issues for Congress, R43334, April 7, 2014.

CRS Report, "The State of Campaign Finance Policy: Recent Developments and Issues for Congress", R41542, June 23, 2016. Assignment(s) Due Today:

Robert F. Bauer, More Soft Money, Hard Law, 2nd edition, Perkins Cole, 2004.

David B. Magleby & J. Quin Monson, editors, The Last Hurrah: Soft Money and Issue Advocacy in the 2002 Congressional Elections, Brookings Institution, 2004.

Melvin I. Urofsky, Money & Free Speech: Campaign Finance Reform and the Courts, University Press of Kansas, 2005.

David C.W. Parker, The Power of Money in Congressional Campaigns, 1880-2006, University of Oklahoma Press, 2008.

Richard M. Skinner, More Than Money: Interest Group Action in Congressional Elections, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006.

Marian Currinder, Money in the House: Campaign Funds and Congressional Party Politics, Westview Press, 2009.

## **POLITICAL MANAGEMENT & ADVOCACY**

Mark J. Rozell, Clyde Wilcox, & Michael M. Franz, Interest Groups in American Campaigns: The New Face of Electioneering, 3rd Edition, Oxford University Press, 2011.

Paul S. Herrnson, Christopher J. Deering, & Clyde Wilcox, editors, Interest Groups Unleashed, CQ Press, 2012.

Eric S. Herberlig & Bruce A. Larson, Congressional Parties, Institutional Ambition, and the Financing of Majority Control, University of Michigan Press, 2012.

Michael M. Franz, *Choices and Changes: Interest Groups in the Electoral Process*, Temple University Press, 2008.

### **SOCIAL MEDIA**

Jason Gainous & Kevin M. Wagner, *Tweeting To Power: The Social Media Revolution in American Politics*, Oxford University Press, 2014.

Helen Margetts, Peter John, Scott Hale & Taha Yasseri, *Political Turbulence: How Social Media Shape Collective Action*, Princeton University Press, 2017.

Burton, Michael John and Daniel M. Shea. *Campaign Craft: The Strategies, Tactics and Art of Political Campaign Management*. Praeger, 4th ed., 2010.

Denton, Robert E. Jr. *Political Communications Ethics: An Oxymoron? Connecticut: Praeger Series in Political Communication*, 2000.

Dezenhall, Eric with John Weber. *Damage Control: How to Get the Upper Hand When Your Business is Under Attack*. Penguin Group, 2007.

Goldel, Kirby with Charlie Cook (intro). *Political Polling in the Digital Age: The Challenge of Measuring and Understanding Public Opinion*. Louisiana State University Press, 2011.

Graber, Doris A. "External Communication: The Public Relations Face" *Public Sector Communication: How Organizations Manage Information*. Washington, D.C.; Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1992, pp. 239-281.

Heilmann, John and Mark Halpren. *Game Change: Obama and the Clintons, McCain and Palin, and the Race of a Lifetime (Kindle Edition)*. HarperCollins e-books, 2010.

Heinrichs, Jay. *Thank You For Arguing: What Aristotle, Lincoln and Homer Simpson Can Teach Us About The Art of Persuasion*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 2007.

Kafathil, Shanthi. *Developing Independent Media as an Institution of Accountable Governance: A How-to Guide (World Bank Working Papers)*. World Bank Publications, 2011.

### **REFERENCE BOOKS**

William Strunk Jr. and E.B. White, *The Elements of Style, Special 2011 ed.* (Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon, 2011). This low-cost paperback is available at USC, and many commercial bookstores and you may order it online.



APA Style Guide such as Hacker, Diana and Nancy Sommer's *A Pocket APA Style Manual (APA Version)*, 2018 ISBN-13: 978-1319057435. This low-cost paperback is available via Amazon online and many commercial bookstores.

Use a *Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary*, particularly that dictionary's "Handbook of Style", in preparation of course papers.