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
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)

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.


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 & Zoom:** 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 Zoom for all weekly and core live sessions.

**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 Zoom.** *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 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 Zoom.** The core live session schedule will be:

- Friday, June 19, 2020: 8:00am – 11:30am
- Saturday, June 20, 2020: 8:00am – 11:30am
- Saturday, July 18, 2020: 8:00am – 11:30am
- Saturday, July 18, 2020: 1:00 – 5:00pm (As groups outside of class)
- Sunday, July 19, 2020: 8:00am – 11:30am
COURSE SCHEDULE & DELIVERABLES

Week One (May 20-26, 2020)
Introduction to Advocacy

Readings:


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:


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:**
Pages 133-186

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:**
Pages 12-81

Federalist 39 & Federalist 47

**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:

Federalist 39

Course Time:
Core Live Session I
Friday, June 19, 2020: 8:00am – 11:30am

Core Live Session II
Saturday, June 20, 2020: 8:00am – 11:30am

Week Six (June 24-30, 2020)
Direct v. Indirect Democracies

Readings:
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:

**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:**


**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:**


**Course Time:**

**Core Live Session III**

Saturday, July 18, 2020: 8:00am – 11:30am

**Group Study:** 1:00 – 5:00pm

In-class advocacy peer review
Core Live Session IV  
Sunday, July 19, 2020: 8:00am – 11:30am

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:  


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:  

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:
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.

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 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, Arial 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:** 5% 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:** In no less than eight pages, as a team (one paper per team) 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.

**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 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 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: 10% 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 Zoom 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.

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

**GRADING SCALE**
Course final grades will be determined using the following scale:

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

| TOTAL        | 1,000      | 100%              |
## Individual Assignments Rubric
*(Legislative Proposal Letter, Mock-up Legislation, Advocacy Peer Review, & Personal Engagement Reflection)*

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

---

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

**Presentation Rubric (Group)**

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

**Discussion Board Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Partially Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance, Application, Originality</td>
<td>Fails to address the question posed, non-serious or not contemplative response, lacks value-added information, thought patterns difficult to follow. (1)</td>
<td>Addresses the question, some relation to topic, inconsistencies in unity and / or coherence. (2)</td>
<td>Addresses the question, uses ideas from project research, adds some content, usually has clear focus. (3)</td>
<td>Addresses the question, uses ideas from project research, offers a unique perspective and clear focus, is fluent and cohesive. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight, Observation, Analysis</td>
<td>No clear concept addressed, lacks clarity of ideas, minimal understanding of the assignment.</td>
<td>Addresses concepts already highlighted, rudimentary development of ideas, some understanding of</td>
<td>Offers a concept worth thinking about, develops ideas, demonstrates understanding of</td>
<td>Offers significant concept or idea worth thinking about, ideas developed in depth, shows clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details/Evidence __/2 points</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>the assignment. (2)</td>
<td>assignment. (3)</td>
<td>understanding of the assignment. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details are random, inappropriate, or barely apparent. (0)</td>
<td>Details lack elaboration or are repetitive. (0)</td>
<td>Details are elaborated and pertinent to the course. (1)</td>
<td>Details are effective, explicit, and pertinent to the course. (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar, usage, mechanics __/1 point</td>
<td>Errors are frequent and severe. (0)</td>
<td>Multiple errors and / or patterns of errors are evident. (0)</td>
<td>Some errors are present. (1)</td>
<td>Few, if any, errors are present. (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participation Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective/Criteria</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment to the course ____/30 points</strong></td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Reasonable level of activity and involvement in course tasks and activities; engages in team interactions and class live sessions; meets deadlines (20)</td>
<td>High level of activity and proactive involvement in course tasks and activities; constructive engagement in class interactions and live sessions; always meets deadlines. (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual contributions on point for this course ____/30 points</strong></td>
<td>Provides some contributions that advance the understanding of class members and addresses the objectives of the course. (10)</td>
<td>Regularly contributes conceptual ideas that advance the goals and tasks of fellow students and advances the end objectives of the course. (20)</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional teamwork and positive relationships ____/40 points</strong></td>
<td>Communications in team meetings; live time; and other interactions absent or sometimes lacking professionalism or do not help keep class cohesive and working</td>
<td>Communications and team interactions are mostly constructive and professional; listening skills are present; communications are always professional. (20)</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
constructively. (10) 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/


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

RESEARCH

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


MEDIA/MESSAGE DEVELOPMENT

-20-


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_filmmakers_can_learn_from_the_super_bowl](http://www.mediarights.org/news/2008/02/08/three_things_documentary_filmmakers_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.capitoladvantage.com](http://www.capitoladvantage.com)
- The National Alliance of Nonprofit Associations sponsors another vehicle: [http://givevoice.org/](http://givevoice.org/)


*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. 

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.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**


**HOW LAWS ARE MADE**


**HOW INTERESTS ORGANIZE TO ADVOCATE**


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.


CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM


POLITICAL MANAGEMENT & ADVOCACY


**SOCIAL MEDIA**


**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.