

**The University of Texas at
Austin School of Social Work
Leadership Strategies and Policy Practice**

Course Number:	393T23	Instructor:	Diana DiNitto
Semester:	Fall 2014	Contact Information:	SSW 3.130B ddinitto@mail.utexas.edu 512-471-9227
Meeting Place:	SSW 2.130	Unique Number:	63520
Meeting Times:	Wed. 2:30–5:30 pm	Office Hours:	W 1:30–2:30, 5:15-6:00; TH 12:00-1:00; & by appointment

I. Course Description

Policy practice involves the design, analysis, implementation, and evaluation of social welfare by governmental and non-governmental entities. Building on the policy analysis skills that students learned in previous courses, the goal of this course is to provide advanced content in the theory and skills of policy practice in the context of professional social work values and ethics. The theoretical aspects of the course address power, decision-making, and social and economic justice. A wide range of practice skills will be covered, including policy development, comparative policy analysis, policy research, and strategies of political participation (e.g., advocacy, negotiation, coalition building, lobbying, campaigning, and community organizing). Students will also learn other skills relevant to policy practice, including public speaking, media management, testifying, serving as an expert witness, the use of technology, and report writing. Prerequisites for students taking this course are SW382R: Social Policy Analysis and Social Problems and SW392R: Topics in Policy Analysis or permission of the instructor.

II. Course Objectives

Students are expected to build their capacity to:

1. Explain and apply major theories underlying the professional social work approach to policy practice at local, state, and national levels (legislative, executive, and judicial) and to compare them to approaches in related fields (such as public affairs and urban planning).
2. Engage in policy practice tasks across the main stages of policy development (problem definition, agenda setting, implementation, service delivery, and evaluation) in governmental and non-governmental settings with the goal of promoting social and economic justice.
3. Select practice strategies and demonstrate skills appropriate to specific policy issues, taking into account the interests of a varied range of stakeholders.
4. Utilize conceptual frameworks for policy development, drawing on the most recent evidence- and research-based findings on effective interventions.
5. Utilize technology to enhance policy practice.
6. Integrate social action approaches in policy practice to ensure the involvement of traditionally underrepresented and other vulnerable populations.
7. Identify the global impacts of policy practice in order to promote social and economic justice for world populations.

III. Teaching Methods

Three primary teaching/learning approaches will be used. One is presentations and discussion by the instructor, students, and guest speakers. The second is experiential learning, i.e., each student will be involved with individuals and/or groups or use other methods to gain first-hand experience of policy practice. The third is assignments designed to link theory and practice and enhance policy practice skills. Class sessions will be devoted to (a) discussing major theories or models of the policy process, their relationship to real world policy practice, and their relevance for social workers, (b) learning about critical policy practice skills, and (c) discussing students' experiential learning and the relationship of these experiences to the course material.

IV. Required Readings

Textbooks

Libby, P. (2012). *The lobbying strategy handbook: 10 steps to advancing any cause effectively*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Sabatier, P. A., & Weible, C. M. (Eds.). (2014). *Theories of the policy process* (3rd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Additional Readings

Additional readings are listed on the course calendar. Unless otherwise noted, they are available at the UT libraries website.

V. Policies

A. Policies Specific to This Course

Professional conduct: Your attendance, attention, and participation are expected for all class sessions. Participation includes reading all assigned materials prior to the class session and engaging in class discussions and exercises. Lively class discussion is encouraged. Respectful communication is necessary to the learning environment. Please turn off cell phone ringers and refrain from text messaging and other non-class activities. Students are also expected to observe professional codes of conduct with regard to confidentiality, dress, language, and other matters and exercise good judgment while working with agencies, organizations, and other entities on assignments for this course.

Attendance: Arriving late and/or leaving early are considered class absences. **Ten points** will be deducted from the final course grade for the first class absence not due to illness, an (unforeseen) emergency, or observance of a religious holy day (attending weddings and family reunions or work conflicts are generally not cause for an excused absence). Generally, missing two or more classes will result in an F for the course or the need to withdraw from the course regardless of circumstances.

Appendix B contains the self-report attendance sheet that each student will submit with his or her final course assignments at the end of the semester.

Submitting assignments:

- All papers should be word-processed (typewritten) and usually in 12- point font, single- or double-spaced depending on the assignment, and with reasonable margins, or presented in another format appropriate to the assignment (e.g., a PowerPoint presentation).

- Assignment due dates are noted in the course calendar. **All** assignments are due in hard copy at the start of the class period. Except in the case of serious illness or an emergency, the policy process theory/framework assignments due on several weeks may not be submitted late. Policy practice assignments submitted after the start of class will also be considered late for that day unless **prior** arrangements have been made with the instructor, and except in the case of serious illness or emergency, an additional **five points** will be deducted for each day a policy practice assignment is late (this includes weekend days).
- The current edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA) is the style manual to be used unless another referencing style is more appropriate for the assignment.
- Appropriate referencing of citations (authors, titles, page numbers, etc.) is required. This includes giving due credit to others when indirect quotes (paraphrasing) and direct (verbatim) quotes are used. Short direct quotes (less than 40 words) must be placed in quotation marks. Long direct quotes (40 or more words) must be indented. Paraphrasing requires more than changing a word or two in a sentence. Failure to give due credit to others will result in a **“0” for the assignment and/or an “F” for the course. Plagiarism is a form of scholastic dishonesty and will be addressed as such (see next item). If you do not know how to cite appropriately, please learn how to do so before you submit assignments.**

Scholastic Dishonesty: Scholastic dishonesty may result in a report to the MSSW Program Director, the Dean of the School of Social Work, the Dean of the Graduate School, and/or Student Judicial Services. Students may receive an “F” for the course and other sanctions in accordance with University policies, including dismissal from the University. Also see information on UT’s policy on scholastic dishonesty at <http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/>.

Course modifications: Should any modifications or changes need to be made to the course (e.g., calendar, assignments), students will be notified in class and/or by e-mail. Students should check their e-mail frequently, and students who are absent from class should check on announcements made in class during their absence.

Canvas: The Canvas website will be used for some class functions, and some course communication will also be done via e-mail. Also see UT’s policy on e-mail below in section B.

B. University and School of Social Work Policies

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS HONOR CODE. The core values of The University of Texas at Austin are learning, discovery, freedom, leadership, individual opportunity, and responsibility. Each member of the university is expected to uphold these values through integrity, honesty, trust, fairness, and respect toward peers and community.

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT IN CLASS. The professor expects students to act as professionals in class. This means students should arrive on time for class, be prepared to participate in the class discussion, and show respect for one another’s opinions. We will not, nor should we, always agree with one another. In this environment we should be exposed to diverse ideas and opinions, and sometime we will not agree with the ideas expressed by others. However, the professor does require that students engage one another with respect and professionalism.

CLASSROOM CIVILITY. A course brings together a group of diverse individuals with various backgrounds. Students are influenced and shaped by such factors as ethnicity, gender, sex, physical abilities, religious and political beliefs, national origins, and sexual orientations, among others. We expect to learn from each other in an atmosphere of positive engagement and mutual respect. Social Work deals with complex and

controversial issues. These issues may be challenging and uncomfortable, and it would be impossible to offer a substantive classroom experience that did not include potentially difficult conversations relating to challenging issues.

UNANTICIPATED DISTRESS. Students may experience unexpected and/or distressing reactions to course readings, videos, conversations, and assignments. If so, students are encouraged to inform the instructor. The instructor can be responsive and supportive regarding students' participation in course assignments and activities, but students are responsible for communicating clearly what kind of support is desired. If counseling is needed, students can contact a service provider of their choosing, including the UT Counseling Center at 512-471-3515 or online at www.utexas.edu/student/cmhc/.

POLICY ON SOCIAL MEDIA AND PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION. Public social networks are not private. Even when open only to approved or invited members, users cannot be certain that privacy will exist among the general membership of sites. If social work students choose to participate in such forums, please assume that anything posted can be seen, read, and critiqued. What is said, posted, linked to, commented on, uploaded, subscribed to, etc., can be accessed and archived, posing potential harm to professional reputations and prospective careers.

Social work students who use social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, etc.) and other forms of electronic communication (e.g., blogs, etc.) must be mindful of how their communication may be perceived by clients, colleagues, faculty, and others. Social work students are expected to make every effort to minimize material which could be considered inappropriate for a professional social worker in training. Because of this, social work students are advised to manage security settings at their most private levels and avoid posting information/photos or using any language that could jeopardize their professional image. Students are asked to consider the amount of personal information posted on these sites and are obliged to block any client access to involvement in the students' social networks. Client material should not be referred to in any form of electronic media, including **any** information that might lead to the identification of a client or compromise client confidentiality in **any** way. Additionally, students must critically evaluate any material that is posted regarding community agencies and professional relationships, as certain material could violate the standards set by the School of Social Work, the Texas Code of Conduct for Social Workers, and/or the NASW Code of Ethics.

Social work students should consider that they will be representing professional social work practice as well as the University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work program while in the classroom, the university community, and the broader area communities.

POLICY ON SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY. Students who violate University rules on scholastic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary penalties, including the possibility of failure in the course and/or dismissal from the University. Since such dishonesty harms the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University, policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced. For further information, the student may refer to the Web Site of the Student Judicial Services, Office of the Dean of Students (<http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/>).

USE OF CLASS MATERIALS. The materials used in this class, including, but not limited to, exams, quizzes, and homework assignments are copyright protected works. Any unauthorized copying of the class materials is a violation of federal law and may result in disciplinary actions being taken against the student. Additionally, the sharing of class materials without the specific, express approval of the instructor may be a violation of the University's Student Honor Code and an act of academic dishonesty, which could result in further disciplinary action. This includes, among other things, uploading class materials to websites for the purpose of sharing those materials with other current or future students.

DOCUMENTED DISABILITY STATEMENT. Any student who requires special accommodations must obtain a letter that documents the disability from the Services for Students with Disabilities area of the

Division of Diversity and Community Engagement (471- 6259 voice or 471-4641 TTY for users who are deaf or hard of hearing). Present the letter to the professor at the beginning of the semester so that needed accommodations can be discussed. The student should remind the professor of any testing accommodations no later than five business days before an exam. For more information, visit <http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/ddce/ssd/>.

RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS. By UT Austin policy, students must notify the professor of a pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day. If the student must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

USE OF E-MAIL FOR OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE TO STUDENTS. Email is recognized as an official mode of university correspondence; therefore, students are responsible for reading their email for university and course-related information and announcements. Students are responsible to keep the university informed about changes to their e-mail address. Students should check their e-mail regularly and frequently—daily, but at minimum twice a week—to stay current with university-related communications, some of which may be time sensitive. Students can find UT Austin’s policies and instructions for updating their e-mail address at <http://www.utexas.edu/its/policies/emailnotify.php>.

SAFETY. As part of professional social work education, students may have assignments that involve working in agency settings and/or the community. As such, these assignments may present some risks. Sound choices and caution may lower risks inherent to the profession. It is the student’s responsibility to be aware of and adhere to policies and practices related to agency and/or community safety. Students should notify the professor regarding any safety concerns.

BEHAVIOR CONCERNS ADVICE LINE (BCAL). If students are worried about someone who is acting differently, they may use the Behavior Concerns Advice Line to discuss by phone their concerns about another individual’s behavior. This service is provided through a partnership among the Office of the Dean of Students, the Counseling and Mental Health Center (CMHC), the Employee Assistance Program (EAP), and The University of Texas Police Department (UTPD). Call 512-232-5050 or visit <http://www.utexas.edu/safety/bcal>.

EMERGENCY EVACUATION POLICY. Occupants of buildings on the UT Austin campus are required to evacuate and assemble outside when a fire alarm is activated or an announcement is made. Please be aware of the following policies regarding evacuation:

- Familiarize yourself with all exit doors of the classroom and the building. Remember that the nearest exit door may not be the one you used when you entered the building.
- If you require assistance to evacuate, inform the professor in writing during the first week of class.
- In the event of an evacuation, follow the professor’s instructions.
- Do not re-enter a building unless you are given instructions by the Austin Fire Department, the UT Austin Police Department, or the Fire Prevention Services office.

A link to information on emergency evacuation routes and emergency procedures is www.utexas.edu/emergency.

VI. Course Assignments and Student Evaluation

The course assignments focus on developing policy practice skills and require consideration of how theories of the policy process may be used to inform policy practice. The policy practice assignments are designed to comprise a portfolio that may be used as evidence of your work and abilities as you apply for your advanced field placement or a professional position upon graduation.

A. Policy Practice Assignments

Consistent with principles of adult learning, each student will work with the instructor to develop a plan for her or his policy practice assignments. **These assignments are worth 75% of the final grade.** The purpose of these assignments is to develop or enhance policy practice skills. You are encouraged but not required to work directly with agencies (public and nonprofit), organizations, or other entities to gain real world experience. This may include federal, state, or local government agencies; advocacy groups or coalitions; “think tanks”; professional associations; political campaigns; offices of elected or appointed federal, state, or county/city officials; and legislative committees. If you do not work directly with an agency, organization, or other entity, you must show effort to engage in real world policy practice activities. Assignments will be graded based on their quality, comprehensiveness, and potential to affect social welfare policy and due consideration will be given to the effort you have expended to obtain real world experience.

The focus of your work may be on policies related to health, income maintenance, child welfare, alcohol and drug problems, aging services, disability, gay rights, or other area of concern to social workers including budgetary and tax policy. This experience should result in at least one major product and two or more offshoot products that flow from your major product. They may be products that will actually be used by others, products constructed solely for the purpose of the assignment but of useable quality, or a combination of the two. Given the dynamics of the policy arena, the plan for your assignments may require modification during the semester. Consult with the instructor about this as needed. You may work individually, in pairs, or in groups, and policy practice assignments may be submitted individually or jointly. If you work in pairs or groups, it is generally up to the members to negotiate any difficulties encountered in the process of working together, though the instructor is available to assist if necessary. Students are expected to discuss their projects during class as the semester progresses, and during weeks 12, 13, and 15 students will give brief reports on their projects in class, including what they accomplished and what they learned about the policy process. The time allotted to each presentation will depend on the number of presentations to be made. During the last class period, students will display their projects at the School of Social Work, and a reception will be held to thank those in the community who assisted class members and spoke in the class during the semester. Along with your final assignments, attach a **memo** describing the work you did to arrive at your final products, including any work you did with an agency or organization, and other information you may wish to provide the instructor.

There is no course requirement to post your work electronically, to visit elected or appointed officials, or otherwise “go public” with your assignments (and there is no penalty for not doing so) though efforts at engaging in real life policy activities will be considered in assigning the final grade as the emphasis of the course is on policy practice. As adults, you are, of course, free to post your work, contact public officials or others, and make your views known. A word of caution is offered if you decide to do so. While agencies or organizations with which you are working will likely vet your work before posting or otherwise distributing it, if you post or otherwise distribute your work to others on your own, it is useful to obtain feedback on your products from the course instructor and others before doing so. This will increase the likelihood that it is of high quality and decrease the chance it may contain significant errors or is libelous or slanderous. Once your work goes “viral” it may not be retrievable.

Suggested Policy Practice Assignments

1. Write a **policy brief** of 7-8 single spaced pages on a significant policy issue. The brief should be thoroughly researched, well written, contain substantial information on the policy issue and your recommendations for addressing the issue, and be attractively formatted for print distribution and posting on a website (whether or not you post or distribute it). As with other scholarly

writing, make sure you support the content and your recommendations with sufficient scholarly citations and references. Worth 35% of the final course grade; 5 extra points will be added to the grade for this assignment if an advocacy or educational group posts it at its website or provides evidence it has otherwise distributed it; 5 extra points added if you send it to an elected or appointed federal, state, or local official **and** he/she acknowledges receipt of the brief; 10 extra points if you visit an elected or appointed federal, state, or local official or his/her aide/assistant to discuss it, and 10 more points if the official adopts your ideas in the form of proposed legislation or policy. Appendix A contains information on writing policy briefs and we will discuss this in class.

2. Write a traditional **white paper/research report** on a policy issue of 15 to 20 double-spaced pages, including recommendations for addressing the issue. Worth 35% of the final course grade; 5 extra points will be added to the grade for this assignment if an advocacy or educational group posts it at its website or provides evidence it has otherwise distributed it; 5 extra points added if you send it to an elected or appointed federal, state, or local official **and** he/she acknowledges receipt of the paper/report; 10 extra points if you visit an elected or appointed federal, state, or local official or his/her aide to discuss it; and 10 more points if the official adopts your ideas in the form of proposed legislation or policy.
3. Write a **letter to the editor**. Worth 5% of the final course grade; 5 points added to this assignment's grade if you submit it to one or more newspapers **and** it is printed.
4. Write a **newspaper editorial**. Worth 10% of the final course grade; 5 extra points added to the grade for this assignment if you submit it to a newspaper (include the newspaper's instructions for submission and evidence you submitted the editorial); 5 more points if it is printed.
5. Write a **blog** with at least 10 postings of at least 250-words each on a policy issue. The blog must show evidence of scholarly references and other citations and research similar to that which would be used to develop a policy brief or white paper. The blog may be posted for class access only on our course Canvas site or it may be posted for public viewing. Worth 30% of the final course grade. If you do decide to post publicly, one additional point will be added to the final grade for **each person who responds** to your blog up to a maximum of 10 points. Again, be careful of your postings to insure they are accurate and not libelous. **Class members should not repost blogs intended for class use only.**
6. Develop a **talking points handout** on the policy issue you selected, **including specific recommendations for action**. Worth 10% of the final course grade; 5 extra points will be added to the grade if an advocacy or educational group posts it at its website or provides evidence it has otherwise distributed it; 5 additional points added if you use it in a meeting with an elected or appointed federal, state, or local official or his/her aide/assistant; 10 additional points added to the grade if the official adopts your ideas in the form of proposed legislation/policy.
7. Write a **one-page letter to a local, state, or federal elected or appointed official** encouraging them to act on the issue you are studying. Worth 5% of the final course grade; 5 additional points added to the grade for this assignment if you get a response indicating that the official will **take action** on the issue.
8. Develop a **detailed draft of a bill** in lay terms based on your ideas for new or revised legislation and include an extensive rationale for the bill (this rationale may be your policy brief or white paper). Worth 25% of the final course grade; 5 extra points added to the grade if you meet with an elected official to discuss your proposed bill; 10 more points if the official adopts your ideas in the form of proposed legislation.

9. Develop a **presentation** of at least 20 minutes to an advocacy organization, student group, or other entity to inform them of the policy issue you have selected and your recommendations for addressing the issue. Include a PowerPoint, handout, and/or other materials. Worth 15% of the final course grade; 10 points added to the grade for this assignment if you deliver the presentation to the intended audience; 5 additional points added if the organization or group provides evidence that it has adopted your ideas.
10. Make a 5- to 10-minute video on the policy issue you have selected. Worth 15% of the final course grade; 5 points added to the grade for this assignment if you post it or if an agency or organization posts it at its website; 5 more points added if you provide evidence that more than 20 people viewed it. **Do not include video of people who have not signed a release to be included. See instructor if you want to include others in your video.**
11. Develop a detailed **policy memorandum** for a local, state, or federal agency that explicates a new policy or modifies an existing policy to better serve a client group or addresses a pressing issue. Worth 15% of the final course grade; 10 points added to this assignment's grade if the agency adopts your ideas.
12. Write a **newsletter article** for a professional organization, community group, political party, or other groups or organizations that explicates the issue you are studying and makes policy recommendations to address it. Worth 10% of the final course grade; 10 points added to this assignment's grade if the entity publishes it in its newsletter or posts it at its website.
13. Organize an **event**, perhaps a talk or panel presentation at the School of Social Work, or staff an information table to bring awareness to a policy issue. **Discuss this with the instructor** and be sure to obtain any permission needed from the School of Social Work, UT administration, or other authority before holding an event. Considerable preparation time may be required to make arrangements and to prepare materials. The percent of the final course grade this assignment will be worth will be negotiated with the instructor based on the extent of the activities and efforts involved.
14. Conduct a policy evaluation or do a research study on a policy issue of interest or on an aspect(s) of the policy process. If the study requires human subjects approval from the university, the instructor will help you with the process. The percent of the final grade for this assignment will be negotiated with the instructor based on the extent of the study.
15. Craft and carry out a project using the plan detailed in the Libby text. Carrying out each of the 10 steps will meet the 75% course requirement.
16. If you have other ideas for assignments, see the course instructor.

Appendix C contains a form for writing up your plan for the policy practice assignments. Within the first two weeks of the course, discuss the plan with the instructor in person, by phone, or via e-mail and get the instructor's agreement. **No later than September 10, submit your plan to the instructor.** The plan should describe the overall topic of interest; your main learning goal(s) for being involved in this work; if relevant, the name of the organization, group, or elected or appointed official or aide with whom you will be working and your main contact person; a plan of work that includes the activities in which you expect to engage; a description of the products that will comprise your policy practice assignments (subject to revision as necessary), and the results you hope to achieve (e.g., introduction of a bill to the Texas legislature; adoption of a new or modified agency policy). Generally, students do three products (often one major product, such as a policy

brief, and two offshoot products, such as an editorial, talking points, newsletter article, or letter to a legislator). Students are encouraged to select assignments that increase their knowledge of the process policy and policy practice skills. A solid draft of your **main** product is due on **October 15**, of the second product on **October 29**, and of the third product on **November 5** (early submission of any or all assignments is welcome). You will receive feedback on your work so that you can revise as needed. **The drafts are required (not optional) and are subject to the same penalties with points deducted from the final grade if turned in late. All final products are due on December 3. Submit all drafts containing the instructor's comments with your final products. Your policy practice assignments will be graded as a package. You must do all assignments in order to be eligible to receive a passing grade for the course.**

Criteria for Evaluating Policy Practice Assignments:

- 1. Completeness and thoroughness:** How fully has the topic or issue been addressed? Has the topic or issue been sufficiently researched using scholarly and other resources, interviews, and other means to gain differing perspectives and full knowledge of the issue? When appropriate to the assignment, has the theoretical and empirical literature on the subject been incorporated in the paper or other assignment? Does the paper leave the reader with the impression that major questions have been considered, or are important issues left unaddressed? Has the paper or other product been carefully proofread?
- 2. Organization and clarity:** Is the paper or other product well written and organized in a logical manner? Are there appropriate transitions between sentences, paragraphs, and sections? Are the sentence structure, syntax, and grammar of appropriate quality? Have descriptive headings and subheadings been used to improve organization? If the product is in a form such as a PowerPoint presentation, is the work presented appropriately for that medium, e.g., bullets used, phrases are succinct, etc. Has the student addressed issues in a way that can be understood by someone unfamiliar with the issues as well as by someone knowledgeable about the issues?
- 3. Referencing:** Are there a sufficient number of appropriate references? If the product is a policy brief, white paper, or research report, has referencing been done according to the style of the American Psychological Association or other appropriate referencing style? Are the references well integrated in the text? Are short direct quotations noted in quotation marks; are longer direct quotations indented, and are page numbers or paragraph numbers for non-paginated electronic sources indicated for all direct quotations? Are indirect quotes paraphrased sufficiently? Most talking points handouts and other products will also need references. Even if the product is not a traditional paper, attach a list of references used that will show the instructor that the appropriate research has been done.
- 4. Originality, Creativity, and Potential to Affect Policy:** Does the work demonstrate a thorough understanding of the issue and that different viewpoints have been considered, compared, and contrasted? Has the student used his or her analytical skills in a way that suggests more than a restatement of what others have said about this issue? Has the student suggested points that others have not addressed? Is the work prepared in a way that will gain the interest and attention of the intended audience(s)? To what extent does the work suggest that it has potential to affect social welfare policy? To what extent has the student engaged in real life policy practice activities?

B. Policy Process Theory/Framework Assignments

Each student is required to submit a paper of approximately one page in 12-point font on each of five main theories/frameworks of the policy process we will cover during the semester. Please do not include a cover sheet. Each paper must contain the following: (1) a list of five sentences numbered

1 through 5 addressing elements of the theory you think are most important about the ways in which this theory addresses the policy process; (2) A list of three complete sentences numbered 1 through 3 addressing how you and/or social workers in general might use this theory to affect policy change (these statements may be related to your course project, or they could be related to policy change more generally speaking); (3) two complete sentences numbered 1 and 2 noting drawbacks or critiques of the theory or framework such as inconsistencies of the theory/framework with the goals and values of the social work profession or important factors that the theory/framework does not address. Make sure to demonstrate that you have done all the assigned reading for the week by referencing each reading in at least one statement. **Each of the five papers is worth 5 points (5%) of the final course grade for a total of 25 points (25%) of the final course grade. To complete the course, you must turn in every paper.** The papers are due as follows:

1. Multiple Streams: Due week 3, **September 10**
2. Advocacy Coalition: Due week 6, **October 1**
3. Innovation and Diffusion: Due week 7, **October 8**
4. Punctuated Equilibrium: Due week 8, **October 15**
5. Social Construction: Due week 9, **October 22**

Criteria for Evaluating Policy Process Theory/Framework Assignments:

1. Quality of the description and analytic perspective offered in each sentence and application and relevance of the material to your course project and/or social workers' roles in the policy process.
2. Evidence you have read **all** the assigned readings on the topic for the week (i.e., the book chapter articles, etc.).
3. Quality of sentence construction, including syntax/grammar, and attention to proofreading.

These assignments will receive a check plus (✓+), check (✓), or check minus (✓-). If a check minus is assigned, you may redo the paper and submit it the following week. A grade of check or check plus means you will receive full credit (5 points) for the assignment. A grade of check minus means no credit is received for the assignment.

Grading Scale: The grade for the course project and the final course grade will be based on the following scale:

100-94.0=A Work is exceptional on all criteria	76.999-74.0=C
93.999-90.0=A-	73.999-70=C-
89.999-87.0=B+ Work is good/very good on all criteria	69.999-67=D+ Work is inadequate on some criteria
86.999-84.0=B	66.999-64=D
83.999-80.0=B-	63.999-60=D-
79.999-77.0=C+ Work is adequate on all criteria	59.999 & below=F Work is inadequate on most/all criteria

VII. Course Calendar

Date	Topics	Readings	Assignments Due
Week 1 Aug. 27	<p>Introductions and course overview</p> <p>What policy practice is and what policy practitioners do</p> <p>Politics and rationalism in social welfare policy</p> <p>In search of evidence about policy processes and policy practice</p> <p>Theory: Institutional analysis and development framework</p> <p>Ideas for policy practice projects</p>	<p>Sabatier & Weible, Chap. 1, Introducing the scope and focus of policy process research and theory by M. Weible; Chap. 8, An assessment of the institutional analysis and development framework and introduction of the social-ecological systems framework by E. Ostrom with M. Cox & E. Schlager</p> <p>Ritter, A., & Bammer, G. (2010). Models of policy-making and their relevance for drug research. <i>Drug and Alcohol Review</i> 29(4), 352-357.</p> <p>Libby, Introduction; Chap. 1, Lobbying and advocacy: What does it mean, and why should you do it?; Chap. 5, Ten common elements of successful advocacy campaigns: Steps 1 to 3, pp. 103-105</p> <p>Breton, E., & De Leeuw, E. (2010). Theories of the policy process in health promotion research: A review. <i>Health Promotion International</i>, 26(1), 82-90.</p>	
Week 2 Sept. 3	<p>Developing policy practice assignments</p> <p>Libby's ten steps for advocacy</p> <p>Reviewing some basics: How a bill becomes (or doesn't become) a law or how sausage gets made: Clip from Paul Stekler's film "Vote for Me: Politics in America" http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YLgeX8qVwNU</p> <p>Becoming a policy entrepreneur Guest speaker: Jason Sabo, Frontera Strategy</p>	<p>Libby, Chap. 2, The rules of engagement by E. Heagy; Chap. 5, Ten common elements of successful advocacy campaigns: Steps 1 to 3, pp. 105-125; Chap. 8, The ten steps in action: A case study of the strategy and process by L. Libby & M. Carasiti; Chap. 9, REACH the final steps! by M. Carasiti</p> <p>Mintrom, M., & Phillipa, N. (2009). Policy entrepreneurship and policy change. <i>The Policy Studies Journal</i>, 37(4), 649-667.</p>	

<p>Week 3 Sept. 10</p>	<p>Theories: Multiple streams and narrative policy framework</p> <p>Stages of the policy process (problem definition, policy formulation, etc.): The federal government's poverty definition as an example</p> <p>Skills: Writing policy briefs and white papers and the language of love and politics: How to frame and reframe issues using healthcare reform as an example</p>	<p>Libby, Chap. 4, Making law: Confessions of an erstwhile legislator by H. Wayne</p> <p>Sabatier & Weible, Chap. 2, Ambiguity and multiple streams by N. Zahariadis; Chap. 7, The narrative policy framework by M. McBeth, M. D. Jones, & E. A. Shanahan</p> <p>Jeon, Y., & Haider-Markel, D. P. (2001). Tracing issue definition and policy change: An analysis of disability issue image and policy response. <i>Policy Studies Journal</i>, 29(2), 215-231.</p> <p>Kubiak, S. P., Sobek, J., & Rose, I. (2005). "It's not a gap, it's a gulf": An analysis of barriers to integrated treatment for those with co-occurring disorders using Kingdon's multiple streams framework. <i>Best Practices in Mental Health: An International Journal</i>, 1(2), 19-33. http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=fab7f048-490f-49bd-9ca7-6afe68d8e066%40sessionmgr4002&vid=1&hid=4101</p> <p>Reich, R. (2011, August 8). Slouching toward a double dip for no good reason (or, "The most important part of policymaking is getting the problem right.") Available at http://robertreich.org/post/8644148810</p> <p>Review materials in Appendix A</p>	<p>Multiple Streams framework paper</p> <p>Policy practice assignment plan (see Appendix C of this syllabus)</p>
<p>Week 4 Sept. 17</p>	<p>Skill: Advocacy and lobbying workshop Guest speaker: Daniel Williams, Equality Texas</p>	<p>Libby, Chap. 6, Ten common elements of successful advocacy campaigns: Steps 4 to 7</p> <p>Community Tool Box, Work Group for Community Health and Development, University of Kansas: http://ctb.ku.edu/en/tablecontents/index.aspx especially Chap. 30, Principles of Advocacy</p>	
<p>Week 5 Sept. 24</p>	<p>Individual meetings and experiential learning</p>	<p>Readings specific to your policy project</p>	

<p>Week 6 Oct. 1</p>	<p>Theory: Advocacy coalition</p> <p>Skill: Building coalitions: Guest speaker: TBA</p>	<p>Sabatier & Weible, Chap. 6, The advocacy coalition framework: Foundations, evolution, and ongoing research by H. C. Jenkins-Smith, D. Nohrstedt, C. M. Weible, & P. A. Sabatier</p> <p>Brecher, C., Brazill, C., Weitzman, B. C., & Silver, D. (2010). Understanding the political context of “new” policy issues: The use of the Advocacy Coalition Framework in the case of expanded after-school programs. <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i>, 20(2), 335-355.</p> <p>Community Tool Box, Work Group for Community Health and Development, University of Kansas: http://ctb.ku.edu/en/tablecontents/index.aspx Chap. 5, Choosing strategies to promote community health and development, especially Sections 5 and 6 on coalition building</p>	<p>Advocacy Coalition framework paper</p>
<p>Week 7 Oct. 8</p>	<p>Theory: Innovation and diffusion</p> <p>Skills: Writing letters to the editor and editorials Using the media for advocacy Guest speaker: Matt Glazer, Austin Young Chamber of Commerce Evaluating policy, evaluating evaluations of policy, and evaluating policy change efforts</p> <p>Brief project overviews</p>	<p>Libby, Chap. 7, Ten common elements of successful advocacy campaigns: Steps 8 to 10; Chapter 11, Fighting for justice in cyberspace: The role of technology in advocacy by J. McNutt</p> <p>Sabatier & Weible, Chapter 9, Innovation and diffusion models in policy research by B. Berry & W. D. Berry</p> <p>Dearing, J. W. (2009). Applying diffusion of innovation theory to intervention development. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>, 19(5), 503-518.</p> <p>Coffman, J. (2009, October). Overview of current advocacy evaluation practice. Washington, DC: Center for Evaluation Innovation. Find link at: http://www.innonet.org/client_docs/pathfinder_insert_nov2011.pdf</p> <p>McNutt, J. G. (2009). Electronic advocacy. http://policymagic.org/</p> <p>The Community Tool Box: http://ctb.ku.edu/en/tablecontents/index.aspx Chapter 6, Promoting interest in community issues; Chapter 33, Conducting a direct action campaign; Chapter 34, Media Advocacy; Chapter 35, Responding to Counterattacks</p>	<p>Innovation and Diffusion models paper</p>

<p>Week 8 Oct. 15</p>	<p>Theory: Punctuated equilibrium (PE)</p> <p>Developing a professional portfolio and careers in policy practice Guest speaker: Jennifer Luna-Iduñate, Director, Social Work Career Center</p> <p>Brief project overviews</p>	<p>Sabatier & Weible, Chap. 3, Punctuated equilibrium theory: Explaining stability and change in public policymaking by F. R. Baumgartner, B. D. Jones, & P. B. Mortensen</p> <p>Beard, V. (2013). A theoretical understanding of housing and homelessness: Federal homelessness and housing policy through the lenses of punctuated equilibrium theory and advocacy coalition frameworks. <i>Poverty and Public Policy</i>, 5(1), 67-87.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>Dziengel, L. (2010). Advocacy coalitions and punctuated equilibrium in the same-sex marriage debate: Learning from pro-LGBT policy changes in Minneapolis and Minnesota. <i>Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services</i>, 22(1&2), 165-182.</p>	<p>One-page paper on PE framework</p> <p>Draft of MAIN policy practice product</p>
<p>Week 9 Oct. 22</p>	<p>Theories: Social construction and policy feedback</p> <p>Class exercise: Changing policy images</p> <p>Skills: Demonstrations, boycotts, and radical action</p> <p>Guest speakers: Representatives from ADAPT</p>	<p>Sabatier & Weible, Chap. 4, Democratic policy design: Social construction of target populations by A. L. Schneider, H. Ingram, & P. deLeon; Chap. 5, Policy feedback theory by S. Mettler & M. SoRelle</p> <p>Jacobs, K., Kemeny, J., & Manzi, T. (2003). Power, discursive space, and institutional practices in the construction of housing problems. <i>Housing Studies</i>, 18(4), 429-446.</p> <p>Mettler, S. (2002). Bringing the state back into civic engagement: Policy feedback effects of the G.I. Bill for the World War II veterans. <i>American Political Science Review</i>, 96(2), 351-365.</p> <p>Shaw, R. (2001). <i>The activist's handbook: A primer for the 1990s and beyond</i>. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. Available electronically at UT Libraries Web site (Catalog). Read at least one chapter of your choice.</p>	<p>Social Construction theory paper</p>
<p>Week 10 Oct. 29</p>	<p>Individual meetings and experiential</p>	<p>Readings specific to your policy project</p>	<p>Draft of second policy product</p>

Week 11 Nov. 5	<p>Skill: More on advocacy Visiting legislators and other elected officials Testifying before legislatures and other policymaking bodies Running for office</p> <p>Class exercise: Critique Fizzy Lizzy (Liz Morrill presents her case against the proposed "obesity tax.") http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LxJ6QwW5ID4</p> <p>Guest speaker: Elected official TBA</p> <p>Brief project reports</p>	<p>Libby, Chap. 10, The 10 steps strike again! Breaking the tire cycle: A campaign with international impact by B. McCue</p> <p>Ohio Municipal League. Tips for testifying, Helpful hints to make your committee experience flawless: http://www.omloho.org/Publications/tipsfortestifying.pdf</p> <p>Oregon Legislature. How to testify to a legislative committee: https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/committees/Pages/How-To-Testify.aspx</p> <p>Utah State Legislature. How to testify in a committee: http://le.utah.gov/documents/aboutthelegislature/TestifyingbeforeaLegislativeCommittee.htm</p>	Draft of third policy product
Week 12 Nov. 12	<p>Comparing and synthesizing theories for social work policy practice</p> <p>Class exercise: Comparing theories</p> <p>Brief project reports</p>	<p>Sabatier & Weible, Chap. 10, A comparison of theories of the policy process by P. Cairney & T. Heikkila</p> <p>Weible, C. M. (2008). Expert-based information and policy subsystems: A review and synthesis. <i>The Policy Studies Journal</i>, 36(4), 615-635.</p>	
Week 13 Nov. 19	Brief project reports	Libby, Chapter 12, So now you have a law: what do you do with it?	
Week 14 Nov. 26	Individual meetings and work to finalize policy projects	Readings specific to your policy project	
Week 15 Dec. 3	<p>Brief project reports</p> <p>Course conclusion</p> <p>Display and discussion of policy products</p> <p>Reception and thanks to those who have helped us</p>	Sabatier & Weible, Chap. 11, Fostering the development of policy theory and practice by C. M. Weible	Final versions of all assignments and attendance report

VIII. Course Evaluation

In addition to the official Course Instructor Survey that all students will be asked to complete at the end of the term, the instructor may request feedback from students at other points during the term. Students' input is welcome throughout the term to improve the course.

IX. Additional References (by topic)

General

- Alinsky, S. (1971). *Rules for radicals: A practical primer for realistic radicals*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Amidei, N. (2010). *So you want to make a difference* (16th ed.). Washington, DC: OMB Watch.
- Anderson, J. E. (2010). *Public policymaking: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Arons, D. F. (Ed.). (2007). *Power in policy: A funder's guide to advocacy and civic participation*. St. Paul, MN: Fieldstone Foundation.
- Avner, M. (2002). *The lobbying and advocacy handbook for nonprofit organizations: Shaping public policy at the state and local level*. St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.
- Berry, J. M., & Arons, D. F. (2003). *A voice for nonprofits*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Birkland, T. A. (2011). *Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, concepts, and models of public policy making* (3rd ed.). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Blau, J. (2014). *The dynamics of social welfare policy* (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bobo, K., & Kendall, J., & Max, S. (2010). *Organizing for social change: Midwest Academy manual for activists* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: The Forum Press.
- Brown, L.C., Langenegger, J. A., Garcia, S. R., Lewis, T. A., & Biles, R. E. (2012). *Practicing Texas politics* (2011-2012 update). Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- DiNitto, D. M. (2011). *Social welfare: Politics and public policy* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Dunn, W. N. (2012). *Public policy analysis* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Dye, T. R. (2013). *Understanding public policy* (14th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Gilbert, N., & Terrell, P. (2013). *Dimensions of social welfare policy* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Haynes, K. S., & Mickelson, J. S. (2010). *Affecting change: Social workers in the political arena* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hick, S., & McNutt, J. G. (2002). *Advocacy, activism, and the Internet: Community organization and social policy*. Chicago: Lyceum.
- Hoefer, R. (2012). *Advocacy practice for social justice* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Lyceum.
- Jansson, B. S. (2011). *Becoming an effective policy advocate: From policy practice to social justice* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Patton, C. V., Sawicki, D. S., & Clark, J. J. (2013). *Basic methods of policy analysis and planning* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson.

- Richan, W. C. (2006). *Lobbying for social change* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Rocha, C. J. (2007). *Essentials of social work policy practice*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schneider, R. L., & Lester, L. (2001). *Social work advocacy: A new framework for action*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole/Wadsworth.
- Smith, C. F. (2012). *Writing public policy: A practical guide to communicating in the policy-making process* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smucker, B. (1999). *The nonprofit lobbying guide* (2nd ed). Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
Available at: http://www.clpi.org/CLPI_Publications.aspx
- Wilson, J. Q., & Dilulio, J. J. (2013). *American government: Institutions and policies: The essentials*. (13th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Advocacy Coalition Framework

See "Advocacy Framework" at :

<http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/SPA/BuechnerInstitute/Centers/WOPPR/ACF/Pages/AdvocacyCoalitionFramework.aspx>

- Abrar, S., Lovenduski, J., & Margetts, H. (2000). Feminist ideas and domestic violence policy change. *Political Studies*, 48(2), Special Issue, 2000, 239-262.
- Dougherty, K.J., Nienhuser, H. K., & Vega, B.E. (2010). Undocumented immigrants and state higher education policy: The politics of in-state tuition eligibility in Texas and Arizona. *Review of Higher Education*, 34(1), 123-173.
http://www.ab540.ucla.edu/documents/Dougherty_Undocumented_StudsTexasandArizona.pdf
- Kubler, D. (2001). Understanding policy change with the advocacy coalition framework: An application to Swiss drug policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 8(4), 623-641.
- Lugg, C. A., & Robinson, M. N. (2009). Religion, advocacy, coalitions, and the politics of U.S. public schooling. *Educational Policy*, 23(1), 242-266.
- Matti, S., & Sandström, A. (2013). The defining elements of advocacy coalitions: Continuing the search for explanations for coordination and coalition structures.
- Weible, C. M., Sabatier, P. A., Jenkins-Smith, H. C., Nohrstedt, D., Henry A. D., & de Leon, P. (2011). A quarter century of the advocacy coalition framework: An introduction to the special issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(3), 349-360.

Innovation and Diffusion Models

- Hale, K.A., & McNeal, R. (2010). Election administration reform and state choice: Voter identification requirements and HAVA. *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(2), 281-302.
- Koski, C. (2010). Greening America's skylines: The diffusion of low-salience policies. *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(1), 93-117.

- Oakley, M. R. (2009). Agenda setting and state policy diffusion: The effects of media attention, state court decisions, and policy learning on fetal killing policy. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90(1), 164-178.
- Richard, B. (2010). Diffusion of an economic development policy innovation: Explaining the international spread of casino gambling. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 26(2), 287-300.
- True, J., & Mintrom, M. (2001). Transnational networks and policy diffusion: The case of gender mainstreaming. *International Studies Quarterly*, 45 (1), 27-57.
- Vesneski, W. (2008). Street-level bureaucracy and family group decision making in the USA. *Child and Family Social Work*, 14, 1-5.
- Volden, C. (2006). States as policy laboratories: Emulating success in the Children's Health Insurance Program. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(2), 294-312.
- Warren, R. J., & Kulick, R. B. (2007). Modeling states' enactment of high school exit examination policies. *Social Forces*, 86(1), 215-229.
- Wiener, J.G., & Koontz, T.M. (2010). Shifting winds: Explaining variation in state policies to promote small-scale wind energy. *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(4), 629-651.

Institutional Rational Choice/Institutional Analysis and Development Framework

See "Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) Framework" at:

<http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/SPA/BuechnerInstitute/Centers/WOPPR/IAD/Pages/default.aspx>

Akinola, S. R. (2007). Coping with infrastructural deprivation through collective action among rural people in Nigeria. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 16(1), 30-46:

<http://www.njas.helsinki.fi/pdffiles/vol16num1/akinola.pdf>

Basurto, X, Kingsley, G., McQueen, K., Smith, M., & Weible, C. M. A systematic approach to institutional analysis: Applying Crawford and Ostrom's grammatical syntax.

<http://www.indiana.edu/~workshop/publications/materials/W08-33%20Draft.pdf>

Blomquist, W., & deLeon, P. (2011). The design and promise of the institutional analysis and development framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1), 1-6.

Ostrom, E. (2011). Background on the institutional analysis and development framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(1), 7-27.

Sobeck, J. (2003). Comparing policy process frameworks: What do they tell us about group membership and participation for policy development? *Administration & Society*, 35(3), 350-374.

Multiple Streams Theory

Boscarino, J. E. (2009). Surfing for problems: Advocacy group strategy in U.S. forestry politics. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 37(3), 415-434.

Blewden, M., Carroll, P., & Witten, K. (2010). The use of social science research to inform policy

development: case studies from recent immigration policy. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, 5(1), 13-25. <http://www.esocsci.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Use-of-social-science-research....pdf>

- Craig, R. L., Felix, H. C., Walker, J. F., & Phillips, M. M. (2010). Public health professionals as policy entrepreneurs: Arkansas's childhood obesity policy experience. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(11), 2047-2052. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2951957/>
- Gates, T.G. (2010). The problem, policy, and political streams of the Employment Non-discrimination Act of 2009: Implications for social work practice. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 22(3), 354-369.
- Henestra, D. (2010). Explaining local policy choices: A Multiple Streams analysis of municipal emergency management. *Canadian Public Administration*, 53(2), 241-258.
- Kingdon, J. A. (2003). *Agendas, alternatives, & public policies* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Lenton, S., & Allsop, S. (2010). A tale of CIN--the Cannabis infringement notice scheme in Western Australia. *Addiction* 105(5), 808-816.
- Ness, E. C., & Mistretta, M. A. (2009). Policy adoption in North Carolina and Tennessee: A comparative case study of lottery beneficiaries. *The Review of Higher Education*, 32(4), 489-514.
- Pralle, S. B. (2009). Agenda-setting and climate change. *Environmental Politics*, 18(5), 781-799. Available at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09644010903157115>
- Robinson, S.E., & Eller, W.S. (2010). Participation in Policy Streams: Testing the Separation of Problems and Solutions in Subnational Policy Systems. *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(2), 199-216.
- Stout, K. E., & Stevens, B. (2000). The case of the failed diversity rule: A multiple streams analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(4), 341-355.

Narrative Policy Framework

- Fløttum, J. & Gjerstad, Ø. (2013). Arguing for climate policy through the linguistic construction of narratives and vides: The case of the South-African green paper "National Climate Change Response." *Climatic Change*, 118, 417-430.
- Paschen, J-A., & Ison, R. (2014). Narrative research in climate change adaptation—Exploring a complementary paradigm for research and governance. *Research Policy*, 43, 1083-1092.

Network Approach

- Adam, S., & Kriesi, H. (2007). The network approach. In P. A. Sabatier (Ed.). *Theories of the policy process* (2nd ed., pp. 129-154). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Barnes, M., MacLean, J., & Cousens, L. (2010). Understanding the structure of community collaboration: The case of one Canadian health promotion network. *Health Promotion International*, 25(2), 238-247.
- Scott, C., & Hofmeyer. (2007). Networks and social capital: A relational approach to primary healthcare reform. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 5(9). Can be accessed directly at <http://www.health->

policy-systems.com/content/5/1/9

Policy Feedback Theory

Jordan, J. (2013). Policy feedback and support for the welfare state. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 23(2), 134-148.

Punctuated Equilibrium Theory

Feder-Bubis, P., & Chinitz, D. (2010). Punctuated equilibrium and path dependency in coexistence: The Israeli health system and theories of change. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy & Law*, 35(4), 595-614 <http://jhpl.dukejournals.org/content/35/4/595.full.pdf>

Schneider, A. L. (2006). Patterns of change in the use of imprisonment in the American states: An integration of path dependence, punctuated equilibrium and policy design approaches. *Political Research Quarterly*, 59(3), 457-470.

Singh, R., Mathiassen, L., Stachura, M. E., & Astapova, E. V. (2010). Sustainable rural telehealth innovation: A public health case study. *Health Services Research*, 45(4), 98-1004. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2910565/>

True, J. L. (2000). Avalanches and incrementalism: Making policy and budgets in the United States. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 30(1), 3-18.

Social Construction Theory

Dauda, C.L. (2010). Childhood, age of consent and moral regulation in Canada and the UK. *Contemporary Politics*, 16(3), 227-247.

Farrell, A., & Fahy, S. (2009). The problem of human trafficking in the U.S.: Public frames and policy responses. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(6), 617-626.

Brucker, D. L. (2009). Social construction of disability and substance abuse within public disability benefit systems. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 20(5), 418-423.

Mitchell, L. (2010). Constructions of childhood in early childhood education policy debate in New Zealand. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 11(4), 328-341. <http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10289/5012/12-06%20Mitchell.pdf?sequence=2>

Note: In addition to extensive bibliographies at the end of each chapter in the Sabatier & Wieble book, the social construction provides a table with examples of applications of social construction theory to many topics directly relevant to social work.

Appendix A: Writing Policy Briefs and White Papers (If clicking on link does not work, paste address into browser.)

1. Many guides are available for writing policy briefs, white papers, and position papers. The approaches suggested vary. Review these five examples (if the link does not open when you click on it, try pasting the link into a browser):
 - a. The Policy Brief by Eoin Young and Lisa Quinn:
http://sobek.colorado.edu/~salucci/teaching/teaching_portfolio/assets/Policy_Brief_instructions.pdf
 - b. Preparing a Policy Issue Brief by Frederick Eisele:
https://www.courses.psu.edu/hpa/hpa301_fre1/IBInstructions_fa02.PDF
 - c. Community-Based Monitoring System (CBMS) Network Coordinating Team, Guidelines for Writing a Policy Brief: http://www.pep-net.org/fileadmin/medias/pdf/CBMS_country_proj_profiles/Philippines/CBMS_forms/Guidelines_for_Writing_a_Policy_Brief.pdf
 - d. Study Guides and Strategies, Writing Position Papers:
<http://www.studygs.net/wrtstr9.htm>
 - e. Some thoughts about writing white papers (Some interesting points made, though I am not, of course, promoting commercial products.): see “Writing Research Papers and Sharing Knowledge with Humankind” and “White Paper—Hide the Sales Angle but Make the Sale”:
<http://whitepapertemplate.net/category/white-paper/>

2. Compare and contrast the following brief, report, paper, or backgrounder on immigration and compare them to the criteria in guides for writing policy briefs and other types of policy papers listed above.
 - a. Hira, R. (2010, February 17). Bridge to immigration or cheap temporary labor? The H-1B & L-1 Visa Programs are a source of both. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute. Available at <http://www.epi.org/publication/bp257/>
 - b. Immigration Policy Center. (2010, March). Focusing on the solutions: Key principles of comprehensive immigration reform. Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/focusing-solutions-key-principles-comprehensive-immigration-reform>
 - c. North, D. S. (2010, January). A bailout for illegal immigrants? Lessons from the implementation of the 1986 IRCA amnesty. Center for Immigration Studies. Available at <http://www.cis.org/irca-amnesty>
 - d. Pastor, M., Scoggins, J., Tran, J., & Ortiz, R. (2010, January). The economic benefits of immigrant authorization in California. Center for Immigrant Integration. Los Angeles: University of Southern California. Available at http://csii.usc.edu/economic_benefits.html

3. Other examples you can also use as guides for your work:

Engquist, G., Johnson, C., Lind, A., & Barnette, L. P. (2010, May). Medicaid-Funded Long-Term Care: Toward More Home- and Community-Based Options. Hamilton, NJ: Center for Health Care Strategies. Available at <http://www.chcs.org/resource/medicaid-funded-long-term-care-toward-more-home-and-community-based-options/>

Long-term care: What are the Issues? (2014, February). Issue Brief. Princeton, NJ: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Available at http://www.rwjf.org/content/dam/farm/reports/issue_briefs/2014/rwjf410654

Neuberger, Z. (2010, June 4). WIC Food Package Should Be Based on Science: Foods with New Functional Ingredients Should Be Provided Only If They Deliver Health or Nutritional Benefits. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Available at <http://www.cbpp.org/cms/?fa=view&id=3201>

Mental Health Parity. (2014, April 3). Health Policy Briefs. *Health Affairs*. Available at http://www.healthaffairs.org/healthpolicybriefs/brief.php?brief_id=112

The following is in the form of written testimony from the Government Accountability Office:
Government Accountability Office. (2010, July 22). Alien Smuggling: DHS Could Better Address Alien Smuggling along the Southwest Border by Leveraging Investigative Resources and Measuring Program Performance. Washington, DC: Author. Available at <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-919T>

Appendix B: Attendance Report

Name _____

The definition of attended a class session is that you were present for the entire session (neither arrived late nor left early). Unless you are ill, have an (unforeseen) emergency, or are excused to observe a holy day, the first absence results in 10 points subtracted from your final grade. Generally, missing two or more classes will result in an F for the course or the need to withdraw from the course depending on circumstances.

Week	Date	Attended Circle yes or no	
1	Aug. 27	Yes	No
2	Sept. 3	Yes	No
3	Sept. 10	Yes	No
4	Sept. 17	Yes	No
5	Sept. 24	Individual work	
6	Oct. 1	Yes	No
7	Oct. 8	Yes	No
8	Oct. 15	Yes	No
9	Oct. 22	Individual work	
10	Oct. 29	Yes	No
11	Nov. 5	Yes	No
12	Nov. 12	Yes	No
13	Nov. 19	Yes	No
14	Nov. 26	Individual work	
15	Dec. 3	Yes	No

The above is a true reporting of my class attendance.

 Signature

 Date

Appendix C: Plan for Policy Practice Assignments

Your name(s): _____

Topic of interest: _____

Organization, group, coalition, agency, elected or appointed official with which you will work (if relevant): _____

Name & title of individual(s) with whom you will be working most closely: _____

Three or four main learning objectives you wish to achieve during the semester:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

Main activities in which you plan to engage and their purpose, goals, or aims:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

Policy practice products you plan to produce (their value should add to 75% of the course grade):

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Results you hope to achieve:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Additional comments, concerns, etc. (continue on back or attach an additional page if needed).