Instructor: Paul Heidebrecht  
Office: Room 4203 in the MSCU Centre for Peace Advancement, Conrad Grebel University College  
Office hours by appointment, Wednesdays 3:00-4:00 PM  
E-mail: pheidebr@uwaterloo.ca (preferred)  
Tel: 519-885-0220 x24225

Course Description

This course explores the history, theory, and practice of peace-related advocacy in the Canadian political context. Content is focused on building the knowledge and skills needed to advance peace by influencing government policies and priorities. Throughout the semester, this course will draw upon relevant and timely case studies as well as guest speakers on specific topics.

Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of this course, students should be able to:

1. clearly articulate a rationale for intervening in the formulation of government policies (i.e., answer the question: Why is advocacy important in order to advance peace?);  
2. summarize and evaluate the mechanics of advocacy in the contemporary Canadian context (i.e., answer the question: How has the work of advocacy been carried out?);  
3. identify connections between challenges encountered in the effort to advance peace and particular government policies (i.e., answer the question: What areas are fertile ground for advocacy?); and  
4. demonstrate their advocacy skills by developing and testing theories or approaches to influencing government policies (i.e., answer the question: How should the work of advocacy be carried out?).

Required Readings

There are no required books for this course. Required readings for each class are highlighted in the weekly course outline and course bibliography that follows, and are all accessible online. Please note, however, that students are encouraged to purchase the book they will be reviewing for one of their assignments.
Course Assessment

10%  Class Participation
15%  Policy Brief
15%  Op Ed
20%  Book Review
20%  Campaign Strategy
20%  Final Exam

Assignment Details

(i) Class Participation

Class time will be structured around conversations rather than lectures, and so student participation will play a crucial role in creating a positive learning experience.

The following items will be considered when evaluating student participation:

- Grasp of assigned readings. Together we will be attempting to nurture a “deep” approach to reading, finding meaning in the text by analyzing the arguments, making connections to more familiar concepts and principles, and then drawing on these insights to solve problems.

- Quality of questions and responses. Students should come to class prepared to raise questions related to the assigned reading. Of course, active and informed participation is characterized not only by the number and quality of spoken observations, but also by attentive listening.

- Contribution to cultivating a community of learning. In class discussions, students are encouraged to be honest, tactful, sensitive, and forthright. It is not likely that we all will agree on all issues, but each person should be respected.

- Throughout the semester I will be drawing attention to events and news items that are related to the topic under discussion for a particular day, or to the course objectives. In order to help make this practice meaningful, all students are encouraged to send me events and news items you come across on a regular basis, either by e-mail, or by passing along a printed copy prior to the start of class.

Class participation is worth 10% of your final grade.
Assignment Details, continued

(ii) Policy Brief

Policy briefs are a particular genre of writing that serve as a vehicle for focusing and making visible the analysis of a government department or a nongovernmental organization (NGOs). For NGOs, policy briefs are intended to spark reflection that will in turn inform the advocacy efforts of a particular organization or sector, giving shape to other kinds of communication to the government or public.

For this assignment, you will need to identify one contemporary government policy—i.e., a plan or course of action that is reflected in a particular program, priority, or law—that you think either is a barrier to or asset for efforts to advance peace.

Your policy brief should be a maximum of 750 words (3 double-spaced pages), and should include the following sections:
I. Context – include a clear statement of the problem or issue under consideration. What is the problem, and why does it matter? Important background information should be included, but you can assume your audience already has some knowledge of the issue.
II. Government of Canada policy – include a short overview of the relevant government policy. What is the government doing, or planning to do, about the problem in question?
III. Your advocacy priorities – include a short overview of relevant priorities, informed by your values, experience, and/or knowledge. What does this lead you to say about the problem in question?
IV. Recommendations – summarize the policy implications of your priorities. Should the government policy in question be supported, modified, or rejected? Be specific and concrete.
V. References – list all sources cited in the body of the text. In-text citations should be used for quotations, which should be used sparingly since Policy Briefs are intended for a professional, not an academic audience.

The evaluation of your policy brief will be based on:
- Relevance. Is there a clear connection between the issue or problem you raise and the particular government policy chosen for analysis?
- Clarity. Do you understand and charitably represent the government’s position?
- Winsomeness. Do you articulate your advocacy priorities in a compelling and convincing way?
- Insightfulness. Do you address non-obvious issues? Are your recommendations more than an afterthought?

This assignment is due on Wednesday, January 28, and is worth 15% of your final grade.
Assignment Details, continued

(iii) Op Ed

Your task for this assignment is to persuade the broader public to share a peace-related public policy position that you hold by writing an op ed submission for a particular print or online publication. You will need to identify an issue or problem (the more current the issue the better), clearly state your thesis at the outset, and support this thesis by drawing on your values, experience, and/or knowledge. You may write on the topic of your policy brief, or on another topic that you already have some background on.

In contrast to the first assignment, you should assume that your audience is pluralistic and thus does not share your commitments, educational background, and social location. At the top of your assignment, clearly state the publication you are writing for. Additional tips for submissions can be found at the University of Waterloo’s media relations website: https://uwaterloo.ca/marketing-strategic-communications/media-relations/faculty-and-staff/speaking-media/op-eds

You may have noticed that most op eds published by national media outlets are signed or co-signed by prominent public figures. You have the option of proposing one such figure who would add authority to the argument you are making. Of course, it must be someone who you have good reason to believe shares your position!

Your op ed should be a maximum of 750 words (3 double-spaced pages). Evaluation will be based on:

- Quality of content. Do you make a persuasive argument? Does your passion or conviction shine through without being condescending or preachy?
- Organization and development. Do you state your viewpoint in the opening paragraph? Are supporting ideas arranged in a logical sequence? Do you focus on a single argument?
- Clarity and style. How readable and engaging is your op ed? Do you write about your position in a clear and compelling way for your intended audience?
- Sentence structure and mechanics. Simplicity is the name of the game!

This assignment is due on Wednesday, February 11, and is worth 15% of your final grade.
Assignment Details, continued

(iv) Book Review

One of the reasons this course does not make use of a primary text is that I am not aware of a single book that covers the range of material we will be discussing. Having said that, there are a number of excellent—and recent—books that address particular themes we will touch on. This assignment provides you the opportunity to deepen your own knowledge of one of these themes by engaging one the books from the bibliography on the following page.

You need to submit your choice of book by no later than Wednesday, January 14. Please note that a maximum of three students will be permitted to review any given book. If there is a book NOT on this list that you think would be helpful to review, please submit a proposal in writing before this deadline.

The target length for this assignment is 1,000 words (4 double-spaced pages), and it should include two major components. First, you need to “come to terms” with the book, presenting the overall argument in your own words, and explaining what the author is trying to do. In order to do this well, you need to provide some context for the book, including background information on the author and the conversation they are attempting to contribute to. You should also briefly describe the structure of the book, showing the logical development of the thesis, and highlighting the kinds of sources that were drawn on to support it. Once again, this means you are doing more than simply summarizing the book. Quotations of keywords and short passages should be kept to a minimum.

The second major component of your review is a critique of the book. This includes highlighting substantive weaknesses, “countering” the text by arguing for an opposing viewpoint, or exposing the limitations of the text, for example, by uncovering an important issue that has been left unexamined. But this could also include highlighting substantive strengths of the book, imagining ways it could be “forwarded” by taking words, images, or ideas and putting them to use in new contexts. Perhaps the book opened up your thinking in an unexpected way. The larger point to keep in mind is that a scholarly critique should always be constructive. Finally, your concluding paragraph needs to indicate whether or not you recommend the book. If you do recommend it, who would benefit most from it?

The evaluation of your book review will be based on:

- Engagement. Did you go beyond superficial summary to provide an analysis that demonstrates thorough understanding?
- Fairness. Did you fairly present the author’s work, or did you skew your presentation to benefit your case?
- Helpfulness. Did you raise substantial issues? Was your critique constructive?
- Overall presentation. Is your review readable? Did you follow the required format?

This assignment is due on Wednesday, March 4, and is worth 20% of your final grade.
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(v) Campaign Strategy
Given that advocacy is never a solitary pursuit, your final assignment is a group project in which you will develop and present a strategy for a peace-related advocacy campaign. You need to identify a single peace-related public policy change, develop your theory (or theories) of change, and map out a plan to effect that change by drawing on your learning throughout this course.

The point of this assignment is not to develop the actual outputs or elements of a campaign, but to convince your audience (your professor and classmates) that your campaign has a reasonable chance of contributing to the change you are seeking.

Groups of two or three students need to be formed by Wednesday, January 21.

There is no required format for your campaign pitch, other than a time limit of 25 minutes, followed by 5 minutes for clarifying questions and answers. You can include video clips, printed resources, or other supporting materials to augment your presentation, but the evaluation will be based on what happens during your presentation alone. All students will be required to provide feedback for other groups based on an evaluation rubric, but the final grade will be assigned by your professor.

Groups will be assigned a presentation time slot during one of the class meetings on March 16, 18, 23, or 25. This assignment is worth 20% of your final grade.

(vi) Final exam
A take-home final exam consisting of several essay questions will be handed out following the final class meeting. It must be submitted by Monday, April 6, and is worth 20% of your final grade.

Additional Assignment Instructions
All written assignments must be submitted in two ways: a printed copy turned in to your professor, and an electronic copy uploaded to the appropriate Waterloo LEARN dropbox.

Late assignments will be assessed an automatic penalty of 5% with an additional 2% penalty assessed per additional day. A valid medical document is required for medical excuses.
Additional Course Policies

**Academic Integrity:** To maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.

**Discipline:** Students are expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offences, and to take responsibility for their actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offence, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offences (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about “rules” for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate Associate Dean. When misconduct has been found to have occurred, disciplinary penalties will be imposed under Policy 71 – “Student Discipline.” For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to this policy at: http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm

**Grievance:** Students who believe that a decision affecting their university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for a grievance. Read Policy 70 – “Student Petitions and Grievances,” Section 4: http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm

**Appeals:** A student may appeal the finding and/or penalty in a decision made under Policy 70 – “Student Petitions and Grievances” (other than regarding a petition) or Policy 71 – “Student Discipline” if a ground for an appeal can be established. Read Policy 72 – “Student Appeals”: http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm

**Academic Integrity website (Arts):**
https://uwaterloo.ca/arts/current-undergraduates/student-support/ethical-behavior

**Academic Integrity Office (University):** https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/

**Access Ability Services - Accommodation for Students with Disabilities:**
https://uwaterloo.ca/disability-services/

The University of Waterloo and Conrad Grebel University College share a commitment to support the participation and access to university programs, services, and facilities by persons with disabilities. Students with disabilities are encouraged to contact the Office of AccessAbility Services at 519-888-4567 ext. 35082 or visit Needles Hall 1132 to book an appointment to meet with an advisor to discuss the available services and supports. The Office collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the Office at the beginning of each academic term.
## Weekly Course Outline

The following may change from time-to-time to reflect the pace of the course and to better refine the course schedule. Changes to this schedule will be announced in class and updated on Waterloo LEARN.

Guest speakers—either in person or via Skype—will be joining the class on a number of occasions, and will be announced in advance of each class where applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading Assignment</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jan. 5</td>
<td>Course introduction and overview</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Student information forms collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 7</td>
<td>Historical context for peace advocacy</td>
<td>Embassy (Jan. 7 edition); Lakey, “Should we bother trying to change our opponents’ hearts?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jan. 12</td>
<td>The evolution of the policy formulation process in Canada</td>
<td>Bruno, “Over last 30 years, public service has been ‘turned on its head’; Griffith, “Policy arrogance and innocent bias”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 21</td>
<td>Theories of change</td>
<td>Embassy (Jan. 21 edition); Green, Oxfam’s From Poverty to Power Blog (5 entries)</td>
<td>Groups finalized for Campaign Strategy assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jan. 26</td>
<td>Theories of change, continued</td>
<td>Selections from Weyrauch, Learners, Practitioners, and Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Feb. 2</td>
<td>Political engagement</td>
<td>Samara, The MP Exit Interview Reports #1 and 2; House of Commons Canada, Guide for Witnesses Appearing Before House of Commons Committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Weekly Course Outline, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading Assignment</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Feb. 4</td>
<td>Political engagement, continued</td>
<td><em>Embassy</em> (Feb. 4 edition); Lindblom, “Still Muddling, Not Yet Through”; Lagassé, “A Democratic or Technocratic Civil Service?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Feb. 9</td>
<td>Public engagement</td>
<td>Bastedo et al, <em>The Real Outsiders</em>; Goodwin, “The changing face of public affairs”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Feb. 16</td>
<td>Reading week</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb. 18</td>
<td>Reading week</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Feb. 23</td>
<td>Coalitions</td>
<td>Raynor, “What Makes an Effective Coalition?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Feb. 25</strong> Enemies</td>
<td><em>Embassy</em> (Feb. 25 edition); Standing Committee on National Defence, “Evidence”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mar. 2</td>
<td>Intergovernmental contexts</td>
<td>Clarke, “Transnational Advocacy Coalitions and Human Security Initiatives”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mar. 4</strong> Intergovernmental contexts, continued</td>
<td><em>Embassy</em> (Mar. 4 edition); Project Ploughshares, “ATT Background”</td>
<td>Book Review due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mar. 9</td>
<td>Insights from advocacy in the global South</td>
<td>Edwards, “Thinking ahead”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mar. 11</strong> Insights from advocacy directed to other levels of governments</td>
<td><em>Embassy</em> (Mar. 11 edition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mar. 16</td>
<td>Campaign pitches</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 18</td>
<td>Campaign pitches</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mar. 23</td>
<td>Campaign pitches</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar. 25</td>
<td>Campaign pitches</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mar. 30</td>
<td>Funding opportunities</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr. 1</td>
<td>Course review</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Take home Final Exam distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Exam due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Required Reading Bibliography


Bruno, Jessica. “Over last 30 years, public service has been ‘turned on its head’ by private-sector style management, loss of front-line workers: Savoie.” *Hill Times* (21 January 2013): 1, 40. Available through the University of Waterloo Library website.
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