EDLP 781: Educational History, Politics and Policy (online) – Fall 2019

Gerald W. Kiel, PhD

Office: 207-7 FR
Office: 301-687-4432
Cell: 440-488-5816
Email: gwkiel@frostburg.edu

Office hours:
Tuesday 2-3 pm
Wednesday 2-4 pm
Thursday 3-4 pm
Friday 9-10 am
Other office hours, including virtual, by appointment

Course Description:
An investigation of current educational issues at the national, state, and local levels, and the concurrent policy decisions, legislation, and regulations related to these issues within historic context. The course is offered 100% online and asynchronous.

Course Policies:

1. All information within this syllabus, including readings, discussions, assessments, and the calendar are subject to modification by the instructor, pursuant to a minimal three-day (3) notification via Frostburg email and/or Canvas announcement to enrolled students.
2. Participation in class discussion is a professional expectation. If a student is not participating at the appropriate level, a consultation will be requested by the instructor.
3. Assignments are due as posted. Exceptions will be handled on an individual basis by the instructor.
4. Policies on Academic Dishonesty, Harassment, and Disruptive Student Behavior are fully applicable for this course.
5. Students with any type of recognized and confirmed disability that would require accommodations in assignments or assessment practices should provide written notification to the instructor by no later than 48 hours prior to an expected accommodation. Students are responsible for providing an accommodation letter prepared by Disability Support Services by the beginning of the second week of the course.
6. Frostburg State University and its faculty are committed to maintaining a safe learning environment and supporting survivors of violence. To meet this commitment and comply with federal and state law, FSU requires all faculty and staff (other than the confidential employees in CAPS and Brady Health) to report any instances of gender-based harassment, sexual misconduct, relationship violence, or stalking against students. This means if you share your or another FSU student’s experience with gender-based harassment, sexual misconduct, relationship violence, or, stalking, I have a duty to report the information to the University’s Title IX Coordinator. Faculty and staff are also obligated to report allegations of
child abuse and neglect to University Police and to Child Protective Services. This obligation extends to disclosures of past abuse even if the victim is now an adult and the abuser is deceased. My duty to report suspected child abuse and neglect extends to disclosures that are made as part of classroom discussions and in writing assignments. If you or someone you know has experienced an incident of harassment or violence, please go to www.frostburg.edu/titleix to find information on reporting options and the resources and services available for support.

7. A Course Policy of Special Note: Particular concerns for doctoral-level professionals necessitate that several standards will be upheld. The standards for professional written communication will be the benchmark for all work. Professional and civil discourse and an expectation of confidentiality within the class are mandatory in the academic environment.

**Course Objectives**

This course seeks to facilitate students in:

a) understanding the historical context of education policy in the United States since 1945; to do this, it is important that students have a basic understanding of the historical development of American higher education

b) developing an applied awareness of prominent conceptual perspectives and literature bases that can be used to examine and interpret the "politics" of education in the numerous formal and informal arenas that comprise the education policy system;

c) researching, formulating, and composing appropriate policy analysis documents relevant to various professional roles and positions;

d) communicating policy positions, impact, and recommendations in an effective manner both orally and in writing;

e) understanding the political processes that shape the formulation, enactment, and eventual implementation strategies of educational policies;

f) becoming familiar with the environmental forces, institutional features, policy network activities, and interest group pressures that affect education policy making in governmental arenas and other organizational contexts (lobbying, divergent institutional policies and inertia, political action, etc.);

g) acquiring a practitioner’s understanding of the role(s) educators play (or might play) in multiple decision arenas, including the resources and strategies that can be deployed to influence education policy and the aspects of leadership that may warrant special attention in efforts to exercise "political leadership”;

h) developing and using basic qualitative research methods, especially surveys and interviews; and

i) working in professional teams on time-sensitive tasks.

**Course Structure and Approach** (subject to instructor’s revision)

This course is offered 100% online in an asynchronous mode. Significant collaboration and alignment with your other semester course have been incorporated into this course. Course modules will open each Thursday at 8 am.
Students will complete assignments that address two of the programmatic threads that run through this course: the development of each student’s research skills and localizing a dissertation topic. Students will apply the APA format and method, consistent with program expectations.

Most weeks I will be posting to Canvas class notes that relate to that week’s topic(s). The notes are intended to provide context and background on those areas being focused on that week as they relate to our study of the history, politics, and policy and the American educational system. I suggest that you read the weekly class notes first before getting into the other weekly activities and assignments.

**Course Assessments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Board Participation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy Article Review</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Review Paper</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Project</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Readings:**


**TASKSTREAM Subscription Required**

Additional readings to be provided by the instructor.

**Assessments**

**Educational Policy Article Review (20 %)**

Select and review one professional, peer-reviewed journal article in the area of educational policy and politics. This review will be posted to the appropriate discussion board area in Canvas for everyone to read and discuss. Use the APA citation as the lead for the review. The review should be between 2½ and 4 *single-spaced pages*. However, realize that when you cut-and-paste your review to the discussion board, such formatting will disappear, and the post will look rather long. This is your professionally focused review of this article. Be mindful that you are coming from an academic perspective and that your audience is an academic population.

**Due date:**  **October 3, 2019 by 11:59pm**

**Policy Review Paper (32%)**

Each student will prepare a policy review paper. This paper will be typewritten, 15–20 pages long, double-spaced, in Times New Roman 12 font, with 1” margins all around. Citations in
APA format are required. You must find at least three sources by using the Frostburg State University (and/or affiliated University System of Maryland) library materials and databases. Additional peer-reviewed and professional sources are permitted and encouraged. Non-validated electronic sources are unacceptable. Think of this assessment as something between a fully articulated policy review that can run dozens of pages and a two to three-page Executive Summary that would precede such a full review.

Your paper will be built around these discrete sections:

- **Issue Definition with BLUF (Bottom Line Up Front):** The policy decision is articulated and its significance is established.
- **Background:** Sufficient background information (technical, political, etc.) necessary to place the decision in its proper context is given.
- **Policy Options:** The various policy options that the decision-maker must decide between are presented and described.
- **Policy Analysis:** The pros and cons of each option are explained. The value trade-offs implicit in choosing one option over another are explained.
- **Recommendation:** Based on the analysis, a recommendation is made. The biases and judgment factors that went into the recommendation should be explained. You should summarize your recommendation concisely at the very start of your paper.

**Due date:** November 7, 2019 by 11:59pm

**Group Project** (32 %)

You will work in groups of three to four. Students will be responsible for forming the groups and for notifying the instructor of the membership of the group and the policy issue to be used for the project. Select a significant policy issue that is germane to your professional role or aligned with your possible dissertation area. Create a 30-minute presentation from a lobbying perspective in which you lay out a recommended position shift, policy change, or new legislative action. Use PowerPoint or a similar presentation format designed for maximum impact to your audience. Define your audience (who is in the room, roles, etc.) Organize around the following sections:

- Define the issue.
- Provide necessary background.
- Make your recommendation with proactive and forceful (data-informed) arguments. During this section, define major alternate solutions with specific arguments that cite the deficiencies of the alternatives along with how your recommendation addresses each deficiency.

Use appropriate citations. Use reliable and professionally valued sources. You will produce more research and sources than will be necessary to cite within the presentation, but feel free to list every citation at the end of the presentation.

You will submit your group project online (one submission per group, please.)
Due Date: December 12, 2019 by 11:59pm

Class Participation (16%)

This course has a significant discussion component using discussion board items. I will be relying upon you to move the class discussions forward. This is absolutely vital at the doctoral level and for aspiring educational leaders. In most instances of reflection and input, you should be able to rely upon peer-reviewed, professional research to support your positions. You will respond to discussion posts and, in turn, will respond to those of two of your classmates. Points will not be assigned, but rather, I will take note of the quality and consistency of your discussion board postings.

Tentative Schedule of Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic/Class Activities</th>
<th>Readings/Assignments Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 29</td>
<td>Syllabus Review</td>
<td>Review syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | American Public Education and the Constitutional Context: Who’s in Charge Here? Overview of Federal Structure | View presentation by instructor on state funding for public higher education to get to know him (presented during instructor’s July 17 visit to Frostburg State University)  
Post self-introduction on Discussion Board  
Read weekly Class Notes on Canvas  
Read “Introduction” in Epstein, *Who’s in Charge Here? The Tangled Web of School Governance and Policy*  
Read *Education in the United States: A Brief Overview*  
https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/international/edus/overview.doc |
| Sept. 5 | The Essence of a Policy Paper  
Educational Policy prior to and since 1950: Maryland, U.S.  
[Equal opportunity (Title IX, etc.); special populations; food programs; desegregation; funding equity; incentivized initiatives; privatization; accountability]  
Federal policy hallmarks | Read weekly Class Notes on Canvas  
Read Steps for A Successful Policy Analysis  
http://stepsforsuccessfulpolicyanalysis.blogspot.com/2011/10/steps-for-successful-policy-analysis.html  
Read Elements of a Policy Analysis  
Review Effective Policy Paper Writing (PowerPoint presentation)  
file:///E:/EDLP%20781%20Fall%202019/Effective%20Policy%20Paper%20Writing.pdf  
Review links to hallmark federal policies for (1) higher education and (2) PK-12 education  
file:///E:/EDLP%20781%20Fall%202019/Hallmarks%20with%20Links.pdf  
Read The Evolving Role of the Federal Government in Education  
Review https://ballotpedia.org/Education_policy_in_the_United_States  
(This is a compendium of information on educational policy in the U.S. The site provides an historical review of policy priorities. Tabs permit drilling into policy information specific to Maryland; this can be sorted by K-12 and higher education.)  
Read/review  
http://www.archives.nysed.gov/common/archives/files/ed_background_overview_essay.pdf (information can be sorted by presidential administration through the Obama presidency)  
Discussion board post |
|---|---|
| Sept. 12 | Who’s in Charge?  
Policy and Politics in PK12 and Higher Ed since 1945  
How the advent and growth of online learning has changed the educational landscape for students, states, etc. from a political and policy perspective | Read weekly Class Notes on Canvas  
Review:  
Review:  
https://www.nc-sara.com/resources/2017-2018-enrollments (Excel database showing online enrollment for each U.S. institution that reports having online students)  
When states work together: read about Complete College America, Western Governor’s University as examples |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sept. 19 | Policy and Politics at the National level (U.S. Department of Education; think tanks; lobbies; special interest groups; unions) | Read weekly Class Notes on Canvas | Review: [https://completecollege.org/](https://completecollege.org/)  
Review: [https://completecollege.org/maryland/](https://completecollege.org/maryland/)  
Review: [http://www.wgu.edu](http://www.wgu.edu)  
| Sept. 26 | Policy and Politics at the State and Local levels | Read weekly Class Notes | Read: [https://www2.ed.gov/policy/landing.jhtml](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/landing.jhtml) (Policy section for U.S. Department of Education; good resource for reviewing federal policies)  
Review: [https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/or/index.html](https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/or/index.html) (Operating structure of the U.S. Department of Education. You can open each section for more detail on functions and roles.)  
Watch: video of Celia Rivas-Mendive, a CRS staffer, describing her daily work in the Congressional Research Service office [https://video.search.yahoo.com/search/video;_ylt=A0geK.ENxHtdIggAoTiXNvoA;_ylu=X3oDMTEybm9hdWdwBGNvbG8DYmYxBHBvcwMxBH2aWQDJg1ODIjMQRzZWMDc2M-?p=Congressional+Research+Service&fr=tightropetb#id=6&vid=44c8a253d332fcb3d6d1703f298e837f&action=view](https://video.search.yahoo.com/search/video;_ylt=A0geK.ENxHtdIggAoTiXNvoA;_ylu=X3oDMTEybm9hdWdwBGNvbG8DYmYxBHBvcwMxBH2aWQDJg1ODIjMQRzZWMDc2M-?p=Congressional+Research+Service&fr=tightropetb#id=6&vid=44c8a253d332fcb3d6d1703f298e837f&action=view)  
Review: How to Get it to Legislators PowerPoint presentation (pdf in module)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oct. 3</th>
<th>Impacting Policy Decisions and Actions: How, who, where, and when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Virtue of an Educated Voter”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal-State Partnerships: What is the current situation? Are better, stronger partnerships possible given our shared system of governance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Leveraging Transition: Ten Ways for New Governors to Advance Education Priorities and Policies from Day One [file:///D:/EDLP%20781%20Fall%202019/Class%20notes%20and%20items%20by%20week/Week%2005/Ten%20Ways%20for%20New%20Governors%20to%20Advance%20Education%20Policies%20and%20Priorities%20from%20Day%20One.pdf]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: Governors State of the State Addresses: Education-Related Proposals (searchable by state; identifies top priorities as identified by governors) [<a href="https://www.ecs.org/governors-top-education-priorities-in-2019-state-of-the-state-addresses/">https://www.ecs.org/governors-top-education-priorities-in-2019-state-of-the-state-addresses/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review: National School Board Association website [<a href="https://www.nsba.org">https://www.nsba.org</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Policy Article Review due Oct. 3 (post on Discussion Board)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oct. 10</th>
<th>The Federal Government to the Rescue: The Impact (Intended and Unintended) of Federal Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read weekly Class Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: [<a href="https://theamericanscholar.org/the-virtue-of-an-educated-voter/">https://theamericanscholar.org/the-virtue-of-an-educated-voter/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: [<a href="https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/civic-education/">https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/civic-education/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: “What Do We Mean by Civic Engagement?” [<a href="https://www.unomaha.edu/international-studies-and-programs/_files/docs/adler-goggin-civic-engagement.pdf">https://www.unomaha.edu/international-studies-and-programs/_files/docs/adler-goggin-civic-engagement.pdf</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read: State-Federal Partnerships in Postsecondary Education [<a href="https://www.ecs.org/initiatives/state-federal-partnerships/">https://www.ecs.org/initiatives/state-federal-partnerships/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review “Principles for State-Federal Relations” [<a href="https://www.nga.org/policy-positions/principles-for-state-federal-relations/">https://www.nga.org/policy-positions/principles-for-state-federal-relations/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion board post: Critique one policy brief from State-Federal Partnerships in Postsecondary Education (link to access shown above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Oct. 17** Standards Movement: Results and Consequences of Recent Education Initiatives (Common Core; Charters and Magnets; Desegregation and Resegregation; Power Politics at the Local Level) Grouping for Final Projects to be finalized (one member from each group for the final assignment to communicate group membership and topic to the instructor) | Read: Stedman, L. (1994). *The Sandia Report and U.S. Achievement: An Assessment*. *The Journal of Educational Research, 87*(3).

Review [https://worldtop20.org/education-data-base](https://worldtop20.org/education-data-base) (this is one recent ranking system of the world’s best educational systems)


October 14, 2019

Read Kirst policy paper [https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/KirstMichaelW.pdf](https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/KirstMichaelW.pdf)

Discussion board post: Critique findings of the Sandia and Stedman documents (2-page minimum short paper with student’s critique, 1-page response to a classmate’s critique)

Read weekly Class Notes


Review New York Times article set on recent school integration efforts (links to articles in module)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oct. 24</th>
<th>Standards Movement: Results and Consequences of Recent Education Initiatives (cont.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read weekly Class Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read Teach for America information on research performed on quality of those who’ve become teachers through the organization <a href="https://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/what-the-research-says.pdf">https://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/what-the-research-says.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review NEA link on effectiveness of alternative pathways to teaching <a href="http://www.nea.org/tools/16578.htm">http://www.nea.org/tools/16578.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watch Diane Ravitch speak on corporate education reform (November 2018) <a href="https://youtu.be/chYSLiPE3Aw">https://youtu.be/chYSLiPE3Aw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion board post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Oct. 31 | The benefits and liabilities of Centralized Educational Policy in the U.S. | Read weekly Class Notes


Review information in module on educational systems of France, Mexico, Finland, and Brazil

Review Brookings Institution project on “Memos to the President”: https://www.brookings.edu/series/memos-to-the-president-on-the-future-of-education-policy/


No discussion board this week

| Nov. 7 | How to Impact Policy at the local/state/national levels | Watch instructor’s video introduction to the module
Read weekly Class Notes
Read “City again rejects $5.6M schools levy” Retrieved from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, November 6, 2019. |


Watch TED talk video (in module) by Geoffrey Canada, school reform advocate and activist [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vY2IxfDBcE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vY2IxfDBcE)

Read information for writers who cover state education policy issues (in module) [https://www.ewa.org/reporter-guide/state-education-policy](https://www.ewa.org/reporter-guide/state-education-policy)

Review information on the Delphi Method (module page with four links)

Discussion board post

Policy Review Papers due

**Nov. 14** Course themes viewed through the lens of the local and state 2019 elections

Read weekly Class Notes

Review information on environmental scanning process (module page with several links)

Read compendium of news accounts of key local and state election issues and results from November 2019 elections (module page with multiple links)

Read article “Accountability and Local Elections: Rethinking Retrospective Voting” [http://home.uchicago.edu/~whowell/papers/AccountabilityAndLocal.pdf](http://home.uchicago.edu/~whowell/papers/AccountabilityAndLocal.pdf)

Discussion board on evaluating the election results of an education-related issue of personal interest

**Nov. 21** Course themes viewed through the lens of the upcoming national 2020 elections

Read weekly Class Notes

Read article on teaching about impeachment (in module)
Read about United Nations becoming involved in higher education (in module)

Read “Who Pays for Free College? Crowding Out on Campus” (re government planning for free college in Chile)
https://economics.mit.edu/files/14234

Read “How Free College Tuition in One Country Exposes Unexpected Pros an
https://hechingerreport.org/free-college-tuition-one-country-exposes-unexpected

Read “The Case Against Free College Tuition”

Read “Where the 2020 Candidates Stand on Student Debt and College Affordability”

Read about Sen. Kamala Harris’s bill to extend the school day by three hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nov. 28</th>
<th>Thanksgiving break</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course themes viewed through the lens of the upcoming 2020 national elections (cont.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete Education Control Decision-Making Matrix

Discussion board post – critique either debt elimination or free college policy issue (details in module)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec. 5</th>
<th>Released Time for Group Project Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project research and preparation time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec. 12</th>
<th>Finalize Group Projects for submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Projects due December 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Article Review Rubric**

**NAME_________________________________________**

Article review: to be posted on Canvas. Review topic is to be related to educational policy and/or politics and must be from a peer-reviewed professional publication or source.

**Formatting:** Use the APA citation as the lead for the review. The review should be between 2½ and 4 single-spaced pages, 12 point TNR font, 1” margins.

**Content:** This is your professionally focused review of this article. Be mindful that you are coming from an academic as well as practitioner’s perspective and that your audience represents both populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formatting</td>
<td>Formatting criteria were not followed.</td>
<td>Effort to comply with formatting criteria evident, but minimal standards were not met (e.g. not APA, less than required pages, incorrect font, incorrect spacing).</td>
<td>Formatting criteria met minimal errors.</td>
<td>Formatting criteria met with no errors.</td>
<td>___/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Conceptualization and Summary</td>
<td>Conceptualization or Summary Missing.</td>
<td>Conceptualization or Summary lacking clarity or definition.</td>
<td>Conceptualization and Summary clearly articulated and detailed.</td>
<td>Conceptualization and Summary fully articulated and discussed.</td>
<td>___/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Analysis (double value)</td>
<td>Analysis Missing.</td>
<td>Analysis lacks clarity or definition.</td>
<td>Analysis clearly articulated and detailed.</td>
<td>Analysis fully articulated and discussed.</td>
<td>___/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Relevance to Policy and/or Politics</td>
<td>Relevance Missing.</td>
<td>Relevance lacks connection.</td>
<td>Relevance clearly indicated.</td>
<td>Relevance fully articulated and discussed.</td>
<td>___/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score: _____/ 20**

*Rubric Scale: Highly Effective, 17 – 20; Effective: 13 – 16; Developing: 9 – 12; Ineffective: Below 9.*
**Policy Paper Rubric** (To use with the required paper)  
**NAME________________________________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ineffective</strong></th>
<th><strong>Developing</strong></th>
<th><strong>Effective</strong></th>
<th><strong>Highly Effective</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **BLUF and Issue Definition**  
Issue not defined. Recommendation not indicated. | **Issue unclear or ill-defined. BLUF missing.** | **Issue defined with clear perspective and position. BLUF implied.** | **Issue clearly and fully defined. BLUF specified.** | __/4        |
| **Background**  
Background missing or not defined. | **Background implied but not focused. Context not clearly established.** | **Background defined within a clear policy context.** | **Background and context clearly developed and connected.** | __/4        |
| **Policy Options and Analysis Summary (Double Value)**  
Policy options missing or only one option proposed. Analysis not addressed. | **Two policy options are summarized with analysis implied.** | **At least three policy options are presented with summary analysis.** | **Three or more policy options are presented with concise summary analyses.** | __/4 x 2 = __/8 |
| **Recommendation (Double Value)**  
Policy recommendation is missing or inadequately described. | **Policy recommendation is presented in an unclear or confusing manner.** | **Policy recommendation is clearly presented.** | **Policy recommendation is clearly, succinctly, and persuasively recapitulated.** | __/4 x 2 = __/8 |
| **Mechanics, Citation, and Formatting**  
Criteria were not followed. | **Effort to comply with criteria evident, but minimal standards were not met (e.g. not APA, less than required pages, incorrect font, incorrect spacing, and/or cites).** | **Criteria met with 4 – 6 errors.** | **Formatting criteria met with less than 4 errors.** | __/4        |
| **Writing style, Grammar and Clarity**  
Style, grammar and clarity errors are frequent and inadequate for doctoral performance | **Style, grammar, and clarity of expression contain errors or reflective of informal writing.** | **Style, grammar and clarity of expression are free of errors and academically appropriate.** | **Style, grammar, and clarity of expression represent exemplary doctoral level performance.** | __/4        |

**Total Score: ____/32**

**Rubric Scale:**  
You will work in groups of three to four. Select a significant policy issue that is germane to your professional role or aligned with your possible research interest. Design a 30-minute presentation from a lobbying perspective in which you lay out a recommended position shift, policy change, or new legislative action. Use PowerPoint or a similar presentation format designed for maximum impact to your audience. Define your audience (who is in the room, roles, etc.) Organize around the following sections:

- Define the issue.
- Provide necessary background.
- Make your recommendation with proactive and forceful (data-informed) arguments. During this section, define major alternate solutions with specific arguments that cite the deficiencies of the alternatives along with how your recommendation addresses each deficiency.

### Group Project Presentation Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLUF and Issue Definition</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue not defined.</td>
<td>Issue unclear or ill-defined.</td>
<td>Issue defined with clear perspective and position. BLUF implied.</td>
<td>Issue clearly and fully defined. BLUF specified.</td>
<td>___/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation not indicated.</td>
<td>BLUF missing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background missing or not defined.</td>
<td>Background implied but not focused. Context not clearly established.</td>
<td>Background defined within a clear policy context.</td>
<td>Background and context clearly developed and connected.</td>
<td>___/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Options and Analysis Summary (Double Value)</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy options missing or only one option proposed. Analysis not addressed.</td>
<td>Two policy options are summarized with analysis implied.</td>
<td>At least three policy options are presented with summary analysis.</td>
<td>Three or more policy options are presented with concise summary analyses.</td>
<td>___/4 x 2 = ____/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation (Double Value)</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy recommendation is missing or inadequately described.</td>
<td>Policy recommendation is presented in an unclear or confusing manner.</td>
<td>Policy recommendation is clearly presented.</td>
<td>Policy recommendation is clearly, succinctly, and persuasively recapitulated.</td>
<td>___/4 x 2 = ____/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persuasiveness of Presentation</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation not persuasive.</td>
<td>Presentation demonstrated persuasive elements but lacked clarity.</td>
<td>Presentation maintained persuasive focus and clarity throughout.</td>
<td>Presentation contained clear, compelling, and persuasive argument.</td>
<td>___/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Mechanics, Citation, and Formatting</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria were not followed.</td>
<td>Effort to comply with criteria, but minimal mechanics of presentation not met.</td>
<td>Criteria met with few errors.</td>
<td>Criteria met with no errors.</td>
<td>___/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score:** ____/32