Name:
B. Kathleen Gallagher

Course name and number
International Comparative Cultural Policy, AMAE 6352

Semester:
Fall 2016

Introduction:
Information and data are available in abundance and come at students from a wide-range of media and sources. Our graduates need to be skilled in navigating what information is offered, evaluating the content and the source, weeding the fact from the fiction, selecting on what they can rely, and considering how their own work contributes to the information ecosystem. Fake news and alternative facts are now identified as mainstream issues. Discussion of the problem raises awareness. Assignments that build individual information literacy skills combat the problem.

International Comparative Cultural Policy (AMAE 6352) is a course in which cultural policy is studied globally. It is an interdisciplinary subject. An individual must be able to identify, locate, analyze, and synthesize information from a broad range of sources and use them to understand, analyze, and formulate alternatives to current policy. Students must also comprehend the iterative and cyclical nature of research. Students applied information literacy skills to prepare a policy brief on a cultural policy of their choice.

Description of the assignment:
This semester-long assignment included 10 individually-graded components that accounted for 96% of the students' course grades (4% or 40/1,000 points are allocated for engagement and participation in class meetings and/or online forums). Each component had an assigned number of points available, from 10 to 350 out of the total 1,000 points available throughout the term. The weight given to each reflected the challenge and phase of development of the task. Fewer points were available for shorter assignments due at the beginning of the term. The greatest number of points available were tied to the final task, in which students integrated and advanced the skills and knowledge acquired throughout the semester. Due to this structure, students received iterative feedback from me that was intended to support deeper learning and contribute to performance on the more heavily weighted tasks.

The 10 tasks were:
1. **Identify area of cultural policy – Research cluster,** 10 pts.
2. **Plagiarism, citation, and advanced search techniques,** 25 pts.[1]

---

[1] This was developed by Megan Heuer. The Plagiarism and citation component was completed through an online tutorial and quiz. The advanced search techniques was a session about 1 ½ hours in length conducted by Ms. Heuer.

3. **Find information about policy area/issue – Research cluster**, 75 pts.
   a. Wikipedia article on the topic (if available)
   b. Opinion piece
   c. News article or government report (choose 1)
   d. Policy report/Brief
   e. Scholarly article
   f. Find relevant policy and data
      i. Find existing policy
      ii. Find data, statistics, figures that explicate the problem, conditions, circumstances surrounding your policy area.
   g. Complete a table comparing these sources on defined criteria. Including:
      i. Is this piece a primary of secondary source?
      ii. Who is the primary/target audience for each source?
      iii. Has this article been cited? How many times?
      iv. Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of each source?
4. **Evaluate/Critique information**, 75 pts.
   For each source above:
   a. Using the Journal Critique guidelines – prepare a critique of the policy report/brief or the academic journal.
   b. Based on your research to date, *identify* the broader policy arena/context in which your research topic is nested.
5. **Topic Manageability**, 25 pts.
   Write a version of the topic which you think would be too broad to be covered within the scope of your policy brief.
   Write another version of the topic which you think would be too narrowly focused.
   Be prepared to defend the scope you have chosen.
6. **Develop position statement**, 25 pts.
   a. Based upon your research to date, using guidelines, develop a precise and clear position on your cultural policy.
7. **Using guidelines, prepare evidence-based talking points in support of your position statement**, 75 pts.
8. **Prepare a position paper, per guidelines, in which you argue your position, substantiating it with evidence**, 150 pts.
9. **Research cluster**, completing the following activities, 150 pts.
   a. "Resources page" – Members of the cluster will contribute to annotated bibliography entries (including sources such as in 2 above, as well as web sites, videos, etc.). These will be posted to Canvas for classmates to become familiar with your research area.
   b. Co-plan class assigned to your research cluster, assisted by prof.
      i. Establish the breadth and boundaries to be covered,
      ii. Plan learning objectives for the class

iii. Plan methods by which students will engage with the subject (reading, lectures, collaborative learning exercises, games, discussions)

iv. Assign readings

c. Class will include individual presentations of each student's research in progress.

10. Policy brief, 350 pts.

Using guidelines, students will prepare written policy brief, 15-18 pages in length.

a. Prepare draft

b. Peer-review

c. Submit final paper.

It is understood that students will advance their knowledge throughout the semester by revisiting and building on their work at each stage with additional research and evaluation. Policy analysis is not supported by "one and done" tasks. You will use the feedback from each task to revise and expand your expertise in your policy area.[2]

Method of assessment:

Assessment was conducted on the building exercises, as well as the final. Instead of assuming they could define and identify plagiarism, they completed an online tutorial and quiz. Several students discovered they could re-take the quiz to improve their scores, reviewing information to be able to answer correctly, which allowed for learning during the assessment.

Instead of assuming students understood what constitutes appropriate scholarly sources, they completed an exercise in which they looked at different sources, and analyzed their appropriate use early in the term. This was further discussed in class, preparing them to make appropriate decisions when they prepared their briefs.

Smaller, focusing assignments limited the breadth of details and allowed students to dedicate more attention to information literacy skills before they were asked to integrate them into the larger final assignment.

Results and impact on student learning:

Students demonstrated awareness of the quality, caliber, and even potential bias in sources of information they used. In an in-class discussion, a student politely responded to another's news source by saying, "That's from (newspaper x, published in another country). They have a specific reputation for being more sensational in how they present the news."

With this new approach, and to balance the work (of students and grading), certain past assignments were eliminated and new ones were introduced. There is not a pre-test, post-test comparison for many of these tasks, which were previously rolled into larger assignments and for which students were expected to have built the skills in their undergraduate studies, or earlier.

---

[2] This is how it was presented to the students. So, while describing it now would call for past tense, it was not in the assignment.

The final briefs were and remained the major assignment for the course and the final demonstration of the students' mastery of material in the course. The quality of the final briefs, in general, improved. I feel the students may also have selected riskier topics that required stronger research skills, but I don't know how one would objectively measure that. I was pleased and feel confident that the skills cultivated will serve these students well as they continue their graduate work and the development of individual thesis projects.

Students' course evaluations, however, indicated that at least a vocal few felt it was too much work. They resisted what they described as "weekly assignments," failing to understand that they would have completed the same work, whether it was submitted for feedback or not. It did increase the number of turn-ins and returns for me to manage, as their faculty member. While they were smaller assignments, the volume did require an adjustment on my part.

Summary and next steps:
Valuing the feedback from graduate students and adapting this for my spring 2017 undergraduate offering in cultural policy, I did revise the number of assignments to be turned in. I plan to incorporate the others as in-class assignments. This is intended to still expose the students to the content while moderating their sense of how much work is being completed. This will reduce direct feedback, but hopefully deliver the benefits without the sense of burden. Specifically:

1. **Identify area of cultural policy – Research cluster**
   Eliminated as a graded task. Students will still need to select a topic, and they will demonstrate this in the position statement and topic manageability task.
2. **Plagiarism, citation, and advanced search techniques**
   Retained. Students seem open to the necessity of this and, I think, view it as an easy way to earn points.
3. **Find information about policy area/issue – Research cluster**
   This will be done informally – as part of their participation. Find x, y, and z and bring to class. At the appointed class, we will go through the process of evaluating – see below.
4. **Evaluate/Critique information**
   Incorporated as an in-class assignment. See #3, above.
5. **Position statement and Topic manageability**
   Both were retained and combined into one assignment. Students need to be able to demonstrate an ability to take a position – and not be ambivalent. I also believe when students grapple with this, and must demonstrate that they have done so. When this is done, and submitted, they better establish the boundaries of their projects and do not select something too large that they either find themselves unable to deliver it in the space provided or that, overwhelmed by volume of information, remain too general. I believed it was possible to combine these so that there are fewer assignments – making the load feel lighter.

6. **Using guidelines, prepare evidence-based talking points in support of your position statement**.

   Retained.

7. **Prepare a position paper, per guidelines, in which you argue your position, substantiating it with evidence**

   Eliminated. There was another shift in the assignments, that I believe will better serve their policy needs. I found most students were confident and competent in their performance on this assignment. I don't believe it added substantively to their mastery of cultural policy and eliminated in the interest of dedicating the time and energy to other tasks.

8. **Research cluster**

   Eliminated. My expectation was that students would see themselves as a resource for one another and for their peers, and as contributors of information. Students, however, didn't embrace it. They remained focused on their narrow topic, rather than seeing it as embedded in a larger area. They treated it as an afterthought. For the work involved from all parties, I did not feel it provided enough value to the process. This is especially true for the undergraduate students who are taking the policy course this spring. Item 10, below, will hopefully be more successful.

9. **Policy brief**

   Retained. This remains the major assignment.

10. **Policy advocacy plan**

    Added. Students are asked to present their position, talking points, and policy brief as elements of an advocacy plan during the final exam period. Students will take work they have already created for the class, and think of it holistically rather than as individual parts. As they become policy entrepreneurs, they will become purveyors of information. I believe this is an improvement to the research cluster.

The importance of information literacy is writ large at present. In a candid discussion the first week of class, students expressed their own concern about how information is being used and presented and a desire to be well-informed in assessing what is presented. I get the sense they are enthusiastic about how this course will prepare them to advocate for cultural policies with solid research and reliable sources.

Appendix
1. Identify area of cultural policy – Research cluster, 10 pts.
Cultural policy "… refers to the state's involvement in the realm of culture (inclusive of the arts), pursued directly or through agents, and encompassing the many phases in the process that ranges from production to the consumption of culture" (Katz-Gerro, 2015, p. 1). The arts and culture sector includes a variety of participants and stakeholders. These institutions, groups, and individuals advocate and seek to advance a variety of positions and policies on a diverse spectrum of interests and agenda. Arts managers, arts entrepreneurs, and arts advocates increasingly need to recognize and understand how cultural policies develop and function globally. Furthermore, the cultural sector is increasingly attached to an array of policy areas. These include education, social cohesion, economic development, and urban revitalization.

During this course, you will explore a range of topics but will develop and expertise in one area. You will demonstrate this expertise in your final task, a written policy brief. Your pursuit of this will be enhanced by engaging with colleagues working on similar or related topics. You will be assigned to a research cluster based on your interests and areas relevant to your individual research (and when possible, thesis projects). To this end, you must first identify the broader area in which your topic resides. In your submission, please identify your intended research area/specialty and 3-5 sources of information and differing types (i.e., newspapers, journal articles, books, web-based sources, etc.) on this topic. Please submit this task via Canvas as noted on the course schedule**.**

Rubric

Criteria	Absent (0-6 pts.)	Beginning (7 pts.)	Developing (8 pts.)	Accomplished (9 pts.)	Exemplary (10 pts.)
Identification of area within cultural policy in which to research. Identification of 3-5 sources relevant to individual cultural policy area.	Area of research is not identified or is not in the area of cultural policy. Poor choice of sources for an academic paper.	Area id'd is not generally considered cultural policy and logic for inclusion is not offered or is invalid. Most sources are inappropriate for an academic paper.	Student identifies an area of cultural policy and most sources are appropriate for an academic paper.	Student identifies an area of cultural policy and all sources identified are appropriate for an academic paper.	Student id's an area of cultural policy and offers thoughts on the broader policy area in which this research area is located. All sources identified are appropriate for an academic paper.

Information Literacy Frame: Research as inquiry.
  Knowledge practices and dispositions:

  Learners who are developing their information literate abilities determine an appropriate scope of investigation and deal with complex research by breaking complex questions into simple ones, limiting the scope of investigations;

Learners who are developing their information literate abilities

- value intellectual curiosity in developing questions and learning new investigative methods;
- maintain an open mind and a critical stance;
- seek appropriate help when needed.

2. Plagiarism, citation, and advanced search techniques, 25 pts.

Students will complete an online module on plagiarism and the appropriate use of citations. They will then attend a workshop developing skills in advanced search techniques with Megan Heuer.

Rubric

	Absent (0-17 pts.)	Beginning (18-19 pts.)	Developing (20-21 pts.)	Accomplished (22-23 pts.)	Exemplary (24-25 pts.)
Performance on online quiz, 15 multiple choice questions worth 1 point each and one longer answer question which will challenge students to apply improved search techniques to locate appropriate, credible, information for the situation prescribed.	(0-17 pts.)	(18-19 pts.)	(20-21 pts.)	(22-23 pts.)	(24-25 pts.)

Information Literacy Frames: Information has value and Searching as strategic exploration.
Knowledge practices and dispositions: Learners who are developing their information literate abilities give credit to the original ideas of others through proper attribution and citation and recognize issues of access or lack of access to information sources; they determine the initial scope of the task required to meet their information needs and identify interested parties, such as scholars, organizations, governments, and industries, who might produce information about a topic and then determine how to access that information

- respect the original ideas of others.

- see themselves as contributors to the information marketplace rather than only consumers of it.
- exhibit mental flexibility and creativity
- understand that first attempts at searching do not always produce adequate results
- seek guidance from experts, such as librarians, researchers, and professionals

3. Find information about policy area/issue – Research cluster, 75 pts.

Behavioral economist Tyler Cowen, in his book *The age of the infovore: Succeeding in the information economy*:

> Coping with information involves both cognition and overt behavior. Most of us can't keep track of everything in our minds, so we call upon technology to help us, or as economists would say, we use capital goods. Because of the web, mental ordering has become very cheap and very effective and thus has become a very powerful social force. (pp. 3-4)

And thus, it is imperative that players in the policy arena (which is everyone) hone their information literacy. In this exercise, you will find at least one example of each of 4 different types of information relevant to your policy expertise.

a. Wikipedia article on the topic (if available)
b. Opinion piece
c. News article or government report (choose 1)
d. Policy report/Brief
e. Scholarly article
f. Find relevant policy and data
    i. Find existing policy
    ii. Find data, statistics, figures that explicate the problem, conditions, circumstances surrounding your policy area.
g. Complete a table comparing these sources on defined criteria. Including:
    i. Is this piece a primary of secondary source?
    ii. Has this article been cited? How many times?

Then you will prepare a list of references using APA (or another, formal citation method) and complete a table comparing these sources on defined criteria. These sources will become the foundation of work you will share as a research cluster. But, a foundation is not the only level that will be completed. You will continue your research and refine your expertise with advanced research. Please submit this task via Canvas as noted on the course schedule**.**

Comparison Table (to be completed by students)

	When was this published?	Is this a primary or secondary source?	Who is the primary target audience?	How credible is this source?[3] How many times has this source been cited?	Summarize the strengths of the information.	Summarize the weaknesses of the information.
Wikipedia article on the topic						
News article or government report						
Opinion piece/article						
Policy report/Brief						
Scholarly article						

---

[3] Rubrics you may wish to use to assess the credibility of your sources are available via:
www.kidsnetsoft.com/internet/**rubric**.doc
https://www.mchenry.edu/library/tutorial/PDF/EvaluatingSourcesRubric.pdf.

Rubric

	Absent (0-49 pts.)	Beginning (50-52 pts.)	Developing (53-62 pts.)	Accomplished (63-67 pts.)	Exemplary (68-75 pts.)
Locate each type of source and properly cite in References. 15 pts.	Sources missing or not appropriate to research topic. Works cited page may be absent or incorrectly presented with many errors. (0-10 pts.)	All types of sources are identified but may not be appropriate to research topic. Several errors are present in the works cited page. (11-12 pts.)	All types of sources are identified. One is not appropriate to the research topic. There are few errors in the works cited page. (13 pts.)	All types of sources are identified and appropriate. Minimal errors are present in the works cited page. (14 pts.)	All types of sources are identified and appropriate. No errors are present in the works cited page. (15 pts.)
Correctly identify whether the sources are primary or secondary. 5 pts.	Correctly identifies type for 0 or 1 of the articles. (0-1 pts.)	Correctly identifies type for 2 of the articles. (2 pts.)	Correctly identifies type for 3 of the articles. (3 pts.)	Correctly identifies source type for 4 of the articles. (4 pts.)	Correctly identifies source type for all sources. (5 pts.)
Recognize that different types of information target different audiences. 10 pts.	No attempt made to connect information types to audience or attempts are misaligned. (0-6 pts.)	Sources seem somewhat relevant to identified audiences. (7 pts.)	Clearly stated the relevance of sources to audience needs and interests. (8 pts.)	Clearly stated the relevance of sources to audience needs and interests. Expresses an understanding of their target audience. (9 pts.)	Connection of sources to audience needs and interests is stated with sophistication. Identifies and expresses a deep understanding of the target audience. (10 pts.)
Briefly assess the credibility of the source. 15 pts.	Student does not identify or does not apply valid criteria for evaluating credibility of sources. (0-10 pts.)	Student identifies some criteria for evaluating credibility & attempts to apply it to sources. Some flaws exist in criteria or application. (11-12 pts.)	Student identifies generally appropriate criteria for evaluating credibility and applies it to sources, as evidenced by reporting in table (13 pts.)	Student identifies appropriate criteria for evaluating credibility and applies it consistently to sources, as evidenced by reporting in table (14 pts.)	Student identifies appropriate criteria for evaluating credibility and applies it superbly to all sources, as evidenced by reporting in table (15 pts.)
Summarize the strengths of the information. 15 pts.	Student does not summarize strengths of the information. (0-10 pts.)	Student identifies strengths of some, but not all, of the information sources or identifies only general strengths, but fails to get specific. (11-12 pts.)	Student identifies generally valid strengths of most of the sources. (13 pts.)	Student identifies valid strengths of all of the sources and articulates deeper evaluation of some of the sources. (14 pts.)	Student identifies valid strengths of all of the sources and articulates deeper evaluation of all sources. (15 pts.)
Summarize the strengths of the information. 15 pts.	Student does not identify or does not summarize weaknesses of the information. (0-10 pts.)	Student identifies strengths of some, but not all, of the information sources or identifies only general weaknesses, but fails to get specific. (11-12 pts.)	Student identifies generally valid weaknesses of most of the sources. (13 pts.)	Student identifies valid weaknesses of all of the sources and articulates deeper evaluation of some of the sources. (14 pts.)	Student identifies valid weaknesses of all of the sources and articulates deeper evaluation of all sources. (15 pts.)

Information Literacy Frame: Information creation as a process.
> Knowledge practices and dispositions: Learners who are developing their information literate abilities recognize that information may be perceived differently based on the format in which it is packaged.

> > iii. understand that different methods of information dissemination with different purposes are available for use.

4. Evaluate/Critique information, 75 pts.

Technology has broken many barriers and increased access to many (but not all) sources of information. Learning to evaluate and critique sources of information becomes an even more valuable skill.

You will use "**Guidelines and Steps for Analyzing Journal Articles**" to prepare a critique of a policy report/brief or an academic journal. Specifics and rubric follow. Please submit this task via Canvas as noted on the course schedule**.**

JOURNAL CRTIQUES: Guidelines and Steps for Analyzing Journal Articles[4]

These guidelines/steps are provided to help students analyze and critique journal articles and to come to class prepared to discuss the readings. They are useful when the techniques are also applied to other sources of information. The criteria and questions are listed in section one. Strategies for putting the criteria together are discussed in section two. An outline for writing an analysis and preparing for a class discussion of the journal article can be found in section three.

I. Criteria and questions for analyzing journal articles
1. **Research question –** (i) What question/s is the article trying to answer? (ii) To what extent is stated clearly and explicitly? (iii) If it is not stated explicitly, are you able to draw inferences from the article to identify the research question/s?
2. **Contributions to the literature –** (i) How does this article contribute to the body of literature and information on the subject? To identify the contributions, you might ask: Have the authors identified a gap in the literature that needs to be filled, or a need to test competing theories/hypotheses, or explore a theory in a new context? (ii) To what extent is the contribution stated clearly and explicitly?
3. **Main Argument(s) of Findings** – (i) What basic arguments are the author(s) trying to make or what are their key findings/conclusions? (ii) To what extent are the arguments or findings stated clearly and explicitly?
4. **Research Design/Data Sources** – (i) What is the research design/data sources (e. g. quantitative or qualitative, data from documents, surveys, interviews, observation, etc.)? (ii) To what extent is the information gathered and analyzed in a manner that is intersubjectively reliable and

---

[4] These 2014 guidelines were written and have been continuously updated by Chris Weible in part from similar guidelines designed by Paul Sabatier and Jim Wilen (circa 2003-2005). Substantial modifications were made by Tanya Heikkila in 2010. Minor modifications were made by Kathleen Gallagher in 2013.

replicable? (iii) How are data limitations addressed and threats to validity controlled for (e.g. control groups)?

5. **Tables and Figures** – (i) How clear and informative are the tables and figures? (ii) Is there a detailed caption so the table and figure can be understood without searching the text? (iii) Do the variables' names make sense? (iv) Are significant impacts clearly marked? (v) To what extent are the tables and figures effective in expressing the basic argument?

6. **Explanatory/Descriptive Approach** – (i) Is the basic argument descriptive or explanatory? (ii) What variables are critical for making the basic argument? (iii) If applicable, what are the independent and dependent variables? (iii) What causal process does the article make with these variables? (i.e. how are the variables related?) (iv) What is the theory and hypotheses for the causal process? Are the hypotheses supported or refuted? (v) Is there internal validity?

7. **Operationalization** – To what extent are variables operationalized (or measured) in a valid manner? (ii) To what extent does variable operationalization adequately represent the variable concept (construct validity)? (iii) Are important variables not operationalized? Which ones?

8. **Statistical techniques (not a strong focus for IAM 6352)** – (i) How appropriate are the statistical techniques in the paper? (ii) Does the author test for assumptions/limitations? (iii) Do the data show what the author says they show? Does the author discuss dissonant findings?

9. **Generalizability** (i) To what extent does the author seek to generalize his/her basic argument? (ii) How valid are the generalizations?

10. **Implications** – (i) Is the article well-written? (ii) Is the writing clear and well-organized? (iii) Could the article be written more succinctly?

II. Putting the criteria together and reading a journal article

Step 1. Read the title and abstract. Then skim through the whole paper taking about 10 seconds to get a feel for the methods of argument. Is the paper theoretical? Empirical? Decide whether this article contributes to your current research objectives before investing any more time and effort.

Step 2. Read/skim the introductory section. The introductory section usually starts with a broad introductory sentence/paragraph before narrowing down to the focus/topic of the paper. Look for the **contributions to the literature, basic arguments,** and **research question**. Sometimes the basic argument is not mentioned in the introduction or is only foreshadowed.

Step 3. Read/skim the conclusion and scan the table/figures. Look for the **main arguments** and the **explanatory/descriptive approach**. The main arguments are often in the first paragraph, in the conclusion, the last paragraph of the introduction, or in the abstract. Sometimes the main arguments are not clear at all. You'll usually find a statement about the **generalizability** and the **policy implications** near the end of the conclusion.

Steps 1 through 3 should take about 10 minutes. At this point, you should have a good sense of the article and be able to answer some of the questions related to the **research question**, the **contribution to science**, the **policy implications, generalizability,** and the **basic arguments.**

Step 4. Read the article through. The last sentence of the introduction usually describes the general layout of the paper. As you read the paper you will come across the theory and methods section. Identify the **explanatory/descriptive approach** and the **research design/data sources**. Look for the expectations, propositions, or hypotheses. Usually there is a section on the case study or topic. Check to make sure that the author justified the importance of the case or topic of study. Why is it interesting?

As you move into the results section, check out the tables/figures. Identify, if any, the independent and dependent variables. What statistical methods are used? Are the variables in the tables/figures clearly and consistently labeled? Is it easy to connect the variable label with the hypotheses, operationalization, and concept? Does the author describe the layout of each table/figure? Does the author adequately describe the methods used, explain why a particular method is used, and provide a clear and thoughtful interpretation of the results? How robust are the results?

At the end of the article is a section for discussion and conclusions. Does the author discuss the limitations of the article and **generalizability** (usually found near the end of the conclusion)? Check again for **the main arguments, research questions, policy implications,** and the **contribution to the field**. You'll want to go back and reread sections of the paper for consistency of parts. Do the descriptive/empirical approach, data sources, and research design support the **main arguments**, answer the **research question**, and back up the **contribution to the literature**? What have you learned from this result? What is the important insight? Is the paper important? What new research questions arise because of this paper, or are new directions for future research identified?

Completing steps 1 through 4 can take more than an hour. You will probably reread the article and skip back and forth to critique it.

Section 3. Preparing for a class discussion and writing up your analysis. At this point you'll want to write your analysis. If you are doing a formal review, follow the five steps below into a typed report. If you are not doing a formal review and instead preparing yourself for a class discussion on the articles, write your informal review (that is, address the points in Steps 1-5) directly on the journal article itself or on a separate piece of paper. You'll want to take this informal review to the class to remind yourself of the content of the article to help you participate in class discussions. Know that the professor will ask you, for example, about the main arguments and research questions found in the article and that you are expected to provide answers immediately – thumbing through the article in search of the main argument or research question will indicate that you did not come to class prepared.

Step 1. Write up a very summary of the main arguments and research questions that the paper addresses. Discuss whether you find it to be an important topic.

Step 2. Discuss the **main** strengths of the article**.** Use the criteria in Section 1 to categorize the main strengths. Discuss them in a logical order. Provide a justification for why you have assessed each of these points to be strengths.

Step 3. Discuss the weaknesses of the article. Use the criteria in Section 1 to categorize the weaknesses. Discuss them in a logical order. Provide a justification for why you have assessed each of these points to be a weakness. Use examples from the paper to back up your claims.

Step 4. Summarize your main impressions of the article and provide a balanced perspective of its overall strengths and weaknesses. Offer some concrete recommendations for how the article could be improved.

Step 5. Edit your paper. Check for typos and awkward sentences. Don't blather on. Keep it succinct and clear.

Rubric: Journal Critique (75 points)

	Absent (0-53 pts.)	Beginning (54-60 pts.)	Developing (61-64 pts.)	Accomplished (65-69 pts.)	Exemplary (70-75 pts.)
Summary section (10 points)	Does not summarize the article. Does not identify the research question and/or main argument of the article. Fails to identify if the article was unclear and, if so, offer conjecture on where the author was headed. (0-6 pts.)	Provides a summary of the article. It may lapse in organization or identifies the research question and main argument(s) by quoting from the article – present but fails to demonstrate understanding and integration of the material. (7 pts.)	Provides a clear summary of the article, including the research question and main argument. Demonstrates limited understanding of these. (8 pts.)	Provides a clear summary of the article, including the research question and main argument. Demonstrates understanding of these. (9 pts.)	Provides a succinct and clear summary of the article. Clearly identifies the research question and main argument of the article, using own words and ideas. If these were not clear in the article, the student presents assumptions and supports, critiquing article as appropriate. (10 pts.)
Evaluates strengths (20 points)	Does not identify merits of the article or misses a substantial number of them. For example, the critique may fail to consider the appropriateness of the methods and data selected. (0-14 pts.)	Identifies some merits of the article and fails to offer sufficient support for the evaluation. (15 pts.)	Clearly identifies the merits of the article but fails to support this with sufficient detail and explanation. (16 pts.)	Clearly identifies the merits of the article and support this with sufficient detail and explanation. (17-18 pts.)	Clearly identifies and thoroughly evaluates the merits of the article. For example, examines the methods and data used, reports these in the critique, and explains why this is believable and reliable information. (19-20 pts.)

Evaluates weaknesses (20 pts.)	Does not identify weaknesses of the article or misses a substantial number of them. For example, the critique may fail to consider the appropriateness, or inappropriateness, of the methods and data selected. (0-14 pts.)	Identifies some weaknesses of the article and fails to offer sufficient support for the evaluation. (15 pts.)	the weaknesses of the article but fails to support this with sufficient detail and explanation. (16 pts.)	Clearly identifies the weaknesses of the article and supports this with sufficient detail and explanation. (17-18 pts.)	Clearly identifies and thoroughly evaluates the weaknesses of the article. For example, examines the methods and data used, reports these in the critique, and explains why this makes the findings less significant or relevant. (19-20 pts.)
Overall opinion of the article and evaluation of contribution (20 points)	Critique may not offer an overall opinion of article or of the contribution to the broader field of study. (0-14 pts.)	Critique may include an opinion of the article but does not explain how this opinion was weighted/fails to offer reason for overall opinion. (15 pts.)	Critique includes a total assessment but fails to consider contribution to the broader body of literature or offers limited support for assessment. (16 pts.)	Critique includes a total assessment and considers contribution to the broader body of literature and offers support for assessment. (17-18 pts.)	Critique includes a total assessment, weighing merits and demerits and assessing overall contribution to the literature and explaining this to the reader. (19-20 pts.)
Style and Format (5 points)	Critique lacks organization and contains multiple errors in grammar and format. (0-1 pts.)	Random or weak organization. Some errors in grammar and format. (2 pts.)	Lapses in focus and/or coherence. Some errors in grammar and/or format that do not interfere with communication. (3 pts.)	Logical organization. Few errors in grammar or relative to length and complexity. (4 pts.)	Careful and/or suitable organization. Writing is free from almost all errors. (5 pts.)

Information Literacy Frame: Scholarship as conversation.

Knowledge practices and dispositions: Learners who are developing their information literate abilities critically evaluate contributions made by others in participatory information environments; identify the contribution that particular articles, books, and other scholarly pieces make to disciplinary knowledge; and recognize that a given scholarly work may not represent the only – or even the majority – perspective on the issue.

- recognize that they are often entering an ongoing scholarly conversation and not a finished conversation;
- seek out conversations taking place in their research area;

- recognize that systems privilege authorities and that not having a fluency in the language and process of a discipline disempowers their ability to participate and engage.

5. Topic Manageability, 25 pts.

- Write a summary paragraph of the topic which you think would be too broad to be covered within the scope of your policy brief.
- Write another summary paragraph of the topic which you think would be too narrowly focused.
- Finally, write a specific research question and a summary paragraph (potentially using an outline or bulleted list) reviewing a topic that would have an appropriate scope for your final policy brief and

Rubric

	Absent (0-17 pts.)	Beginning (18-19 pts.)	Developing (20-21 pts.)	Accomplished (22-23 pts.)	Exemplary (24-25 pts.)
Explore the span between topics that are too broad and those that are too narrow. (0-10 pts.)	Presents limitations and implications, but they are irrelevant and unsupported. (0-6 pts.)	Presents limitations and implications, but some are possibly irrelevant or unsupported. (7 pts.)	Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications but fails to discuss these as they apply to the project. (8 pts.)	Discusses relevant and supported limitations. (9 pts.)	Insightfully discusses in detail relevant and supported limitations and implications. (10 pts.)
Identify appropriate topic and scope for policy brief. (0-15 pts.)	Identifies a topic that is far too general and wide-ranging as to be manageable and doable. (0-10 pts.)	Identifies a topic that while manageable/doable, is too narrowly focused and leaves out relevant aspects of the topic. (11-12 pts.)	Identifies a topic that while manageable/doable, but does not address relevant aspects of the topic. (13 pts.)	Identifies a focused and manageable/doable topic that appropriately addresses relevant aspects of the topic. (14 pts.)	Identifies a creative, focused, and manageable topic that addresses potentially significant yet previously less-explored aspects of the topic. (15 pts.)

Information Literacy Frame: Research as inquiry

Knowledge practices and dispositions: Learners who are developing their information literate abilities determine an appropriate scope of investigation; deal with complex research by breaking complex questions into simple ones, limiting the scope of investigations.

- Consider research as open-ended exploration and engagement with information;
- value intellectual curiosity in developing questions and learning new investigative methods;
- seek appropriate help when needed.

6. Develop position statement, 25 pts.

The term position statement is used to designate a straightforward statement or declaration on a topic of cultural policy. These are typically brief, concise, and do not include background information or discussion. A policy statement generally would not quote facts and figures developed by outside sources and would not utilize a bibliography.

Referring to the examples reviewed in class and presented in Americans for the Arts *Congressional Arts Handbook Issue Briefs* (2016), and utilizing your **research to date**, develop a precise, clear, and defensible position statement on your cultural policy.

Rubric

	Absent	Beginning	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Position statement (25 pts.)	The position statement that is vague and not clearly defined. The reader is not sure if the author feels strongly about the stance being taken. (0-17 pts.)	The writing includes a position statement that provides the reader with an idea of the author's stance on a topic. (18-19 pts.)	The writing includes a position statement that allows the reader to know the author's stance on the topic. The author appears to feel strongly about the stance taken. (20-21 pts.)	The writing includes a position statement that allows the reader to know the author's stance on the topic. (22-23 pts.)	The writing includes a focused position statement that allows the reader to know the author's stance on the topic immediately. It is expressed in a firm and confident manner. (24-25 pts.)

Information Literacy Frame: Scholarship as conversation

Knowledge practices and dispositions: Learners who are developing their information literate abilities cite the contributing work of others in their own information production and contribute to scholarly conversation at an appropriate level, such as local online community.

- recognize that they are often entering an ongoing scholarly conversation and not a finished conversation;
- seek out conversations taking place in their research area;
- see themselves as contributors to scholarship rather than only consumers of it; and
- recognize that systems privilege authorities and that not having a fluency in the language and process of a discipline disempowers their ability to participate and engage.

7. Using guidelines, prepare evidence-based talking points in support of your position statement, 75 pts.

Talking points can be used to prepare for a public speech or an interview with a member of the media. They are designed to sufficient information to maintain credibility in the policy area.

- In this task, you will develop talking points to support a position statement (as developed for task 7, and revised to align with subsequent research and/or feedback). This is your purpose or mission.
- Outline two to three talking points that will support your main message. You will use these to develop your argument supporting your position statement.
- Provide specifics – data, details, and examples that bring your comments from the general to the specific. Instead of asserting that many or most K-12 students in the United States do not have access to arts education (which could quickly be dismissed as unsubstantiated) find statistics and figures to support your claims. You might report that of the approximate ##### K-12 students in the United States, x% do not receive arts education through school. Of these, y% are economically under-served and z% are minority students.
- Provide possible ways for your targets to act on your recommendations.
- End with a call to action. What can your audience do to support your position?
- Provide contact information.

This should reflect your research to date and reflect the progress you have made as your work has continued.

Again, the Americans for the Arts *Congressional Arts Handbook Issue Briefs* (2016) provide multiple, excellent examples. But, be sure that you make your own argument. Plagiarism is plagiarism, even if it is an effort to "copy" a good model.

Your submission should be approximately 1 page long, single spaced, Times New Roman 12-pt font. Begin with your position statement. Provide your talking points in an organized, bulleted list. Conclude with your contact information.

Rubric

	Absent (0-53 pts.)	Beginning (54-60 pts.)	Developing (61-64 pts.)	Accomplished (65-69 pts.)	Exemplary (70-75 pts.)
Content and articulation of facts and issues. (25 pts.)	Ideas are illogical or unclear. Facts offered do not support position statement. Ideas are uninteresting. Arguments lacks credibility. (0-17 pts.)	Has difficulty connecting facts and issues and articulating relevance to position statement. Ideas are not particularly interesting or thought provoking. Demonstrates some knowledge base but is insufficient to generate credibility. (18-19 pts.)	Sufficient ability connecting facts and issues and articulating relevance to position statement. Possesses a good knowledge base. Ideas are interesting. Is generally able to articulate information that builds credibility. (20-21 pts.)	Adept at connecting facts and issues and articulating relevance to position statement. Ideas are interesting. Some ideas are thought provoking. Is able to articulate information that builds credibility. (22-23 pts.)	Exemplary in connecting facts and issues and articulating how they impact the issue locally and globally. Possesses a strong knowledge base. Ideas are interesting and thought provoking. Ideas demonstrate depth of knowledge. Is able to effectively articulate information regarding related facts and current issue. Credibility is evident. (24 pts.)
Organization (10 pts.)	There is no path and/or grouping. (0-6 pts.)	The path moves in a seemingly arbitrary way. Ideas are not grouped or are grouped arbitrarily. (7 pts.)	The path moves in a seemingly arbitrary way. Ideas are only modestly grouped or are largely grouped arbitrarily. (8 pts.)	The path moves logically from one to the next. Ideas are grouped logically. (9 pts.)	The path moves logically from one idea to the next; ideas build on each other. Ideas are grouped in a way that makes sense. (10 pts.)
Originality (10 pts.)	Content is not in the student's own words. (0-6 pts.)	Some content is original. Most content is in the student's own words. (7 pts.)	Some content is original. All content is in the student's own words. (8 pts.)	Most content is original. All content is in the student's own words. (9 pts.)	Content is original and in the student's own words. (10 pts.)
Spelling and grammar (5 pts.)	Spelling or grammar hinders clear communication of ideas. (0-2 pts.)	Some serious spelling or grammatical mistakes. (3 pts.)		Minor spelling or grammatical mistakes. (4 pts.)	No spelling or grammatical mistakes. (5 pts.)

Information Literacy Frame: Scholarship as conversation

Knowledge practices and dispositions: Learners who are developing their information literate abilities cite the contributing work of others in their own information production and contribute to scholarly conversation at an appropriate level, such as local online community.

- recognize that they are often entering an ongoing scholarly conversation and not a finished conversation;

- seek out conversations taking place in their research area;
- see themselves as contributors to scholarship rather than only consumers of it; and
- recognize that systems privilege authorities and that not having a fluency in the language and process of a discipline

8. Prepare a position paper, per guidelines, in which you argue your position, substantiating it with evidence, 150 pts.

POSTION PAPER: Guidelines for Preparing Your Position Paper
Taken from Xavier University Library:
http://www.xavier.edu/library/help/position_paper.pdf
With slight modifications by Kathleen Gallagher 2015.

The purpose of a position paper is to generate support on an issue. It describes a position on an issue and the rationale for that position. The position paper is **based on facts** that provide a solid foundation for your argument.[5] In the position paper you should:

- Use **evidence** to support your position, such as statistical evidence or dates and events.
- Validate your position with **authoritative references** or primary sources.
- Examine the strengths **and** weakness of your position.
- Evaluate possible solutions and suggest courses of action.

Choose an issue where there is a clear division of opinion and which is arguable with facts and inductive reasoning. You may choose an issue on which you have already formed an opinion. However, in writing about this issue you must examine your opinion of the issue critically.[6] Prior to writing your position paper, define and limit your issue carefully. Social issues are complex with multiple solutions. Narrow the topic of your position paper to something that is manageable. Research your issue thoroughly, consulting experts, reliable sources (i.e. not Wikipedia), and obtaining both primary and secondary. Consider feasibility, cost-effectiveness and political/social climate when evaluating possible solutions and courses of action.[7] Your issue should be related to arts and culture. The following structure is typical of a position paper:
- An introduction

---

[5] Tucker, Kerry, & Derelain, Doris, Rouner, Donna. (1997). Building the case: Position papers, backgrounders, fact sheets, and biographical sketches. In *Public relations writing: An issue-driven behavioral approach* (pp. 79-85). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[6] Axelrod, Rise B., & Cooper, Charles R. (1993). Position Paper (pp. 446-4510. In *Reading critically, writing well: A reader and guide*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

[7] Hansen, Kristine. (1998). Public position papers and opinion pieces. In *A rhetoric for the social sciences: A guide to academic and professional communication* (pp. 301-306). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- o Identification of an issue
- o Statement of the position
- The body
  - o Background information
  - o Supporting evidence or facts
  - o A discussion of both sides of the issue
- A conclusion
  - o Suggested courses of action
  - o Possible solutions

The **introduction** should clearly identify the issue and state the author's position. It should be written in a way that catches the reader's attention.

The **body** of the position paper may contain several paragraphs. Each paragraph should present an idea or main concept that clarifies a portion of the position statement and is supported by evidence or facts. Evidence can be primary source quotations, statistical data or events. Evidence should lead through inductive reasoning, to the main concept or idea presented in the paragraph. The body may begin with some background information and should incorporate a discussion of both sides of the issue.

The **conclusion** should summarize the main concepts and ideas and reinforce, without repeating, the introduction or body of the paper. It could include suggested courses of action and possible solutions.[8]

Remember that this is a course in cultural policy.

Rubric: Position Paper (150 points)

	Absent (0-105 pts.)	Beginning 106-120	Developing 121-124	Accomplished 125-135	Exemplary 136-150
Introduction, 30 pts.	Writer fails to state issue, frame the problem, **AND/OR** the writer articulates his/her stance **AND/OR** may fail to identify significance or offers insufficient detail for reader to understand significance (0-24 pts.)	Writer fails to state issue, frame the problem, **OR** the writer articulates his/her stance and may fail to identify significance or offers insufficient detail for reader to understand significance (25 pts.)	Issue is stated, the problem is framed, and the writer largely articulates his/her stance but fails to identify significance and offers insufficient detail for reader to understand significance (26 pts.)	Issue is stated, the problem is framed, and the writer articulates his/her stance and identifies limited significance or offers insufficient detail for reader to understand significance (27-28 pts.)	Issue is clearly identified, framed so the reader understands the significance, and the writer states his/her position (29-30 pts.)

---

[8] Kashatus, William C. (2002) Present history: Position and local history research papers. In
       Past, present, and personal (pp. 46-48). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Body 40 pts.	Central purpose or argument is not clearly identified. Analysis is vague or not evident. No application of theory, lack of depth, lacks evidence of complex reasoning. (0-31 pts.)	Information supports a central purpose or argument at times. Analysis is basic or general, but some evidence of depth and complex reasoning if present. (32-34 pts.)	Information provides reasonable support for central purpose or argument and displays evidence of a basic analysis of a significant issue or concept. Shows some depth of analysis. (35-36 pts.)	Information provides reasonable support for central purpose or argument and displays evidence of a basic analysis of a significant issue or concept. Shows substantial depth of analysis. (37-38pts.)	Balanced presentation of relevant and legitimate information that clearly supports the central purpose or argument. Shows a significant level of thoughtful, in-depth analysis of the issues and concepts. Demonstrates understanding of relevant theoretical issues. (39-40 pts.)
Conclusion 40 pts.	The writer fails to offer a course of action and/or possible solutions. Recommendations and stance are inconsistent in places or throughout. (0-31 pts.)	Writer offers few suggestions for course of action or possible solutions. There are lapses in consistency with evidence presented. (32-34 pts.)	Writer offers limited suggestions for course of action or possible solutions. There may be lapses in consistency with evidence presented. (35-36 pts.)	Writer offers suggestions for course of action and possible solutions that are generally consistent with stance and supported by background information and evidence. (37-38 pts.)	Writer offers suggestions for course of action and possible solutions that are consistent with stance and supported by background information and evidence. The writer offers a completed argument for the position taken. (39-40 pts.)
Organization, Spelling, Grammar, Formatting 30 pts.	Numerous errors in grammar and format. (0-24 pts.)	Errors in grammar and format. (25 pts.)	Some errors in grammar and/or format that do not interfere with communication. (26 pts.)	Few errors in grammar or relative to length and complexity. (27-28 pts.)	Writing is free from almost all errors. (29-30 pts.)
Quality and use of references 10 pts.	There are virtually no sources that are academically or professionally reliable, including various unofficial websites. References are seldom cited to support statements. (0-6 pts.)	Most of the references are from sources that are not peer reviewed and have uncertain reliability. The reader doubts the accuracy of the material presented. Attributions are occasionally given, statements seem unsubstantiated. (7 pts.)	A number of the references are from sources that are not peer reviewed and/or have uncertain reliability. The reader doubts the accuracy of the material presented. Attributions are present but not consistent, many statements seem unsubstantiated. (8 pts.)	Although most of the references are from academically legitimate sources, a few are questionable. The reliability of some sources is uncertain. Attribution is mostly clear. (9 pts.)	Refs. are from academically legitimate sources. The reader is confident that the info. can be trusted. Compelling evidence from legitimate sources is given to support claims. Attribution is clear & fairly represented. (10 pts.)

Information Literacy Frame: Scholarship as conversation

> Knowledge practices and dispositions: Learners who are developing their information literate abilities cite the contributing work of others in their own information production and contribute to scholarly conversation at an appropriate level, such as local online community.
>
> - recognize that they are often entering an ongoing scholarly conversation and not a finished conversation;
> - seek out conversations taking place in their research area;
> - see themselves as contributors to scholarship rather than only consumers of it;
> - understand the responsibility that comes with entering the conversation through participatory channels; and
> - recognize that systems privilege authorities and that not having a fluency in the language and process of a discipline.

9. Research clusters, 150 points.

Research clusters will work together to complete the following activities and build class knowledge of their cultural policy areas of expertise.

> a. "Resources page" – Members of the cluster will contribute to annotated bibliography entries including sources **such as** in task 3 completed earlier this semester[9]. You may wish to review and include web sites, videos, etc., as well. These will be posted to Canvas for classmates wishing to become familiar in your research area. Your entries for each source should do the following:
>> i. Summarize
>>> i. What are the main arguments? What is the point?
>>> ii. What topics are covered?
>> ii. Assess
>>> i. Is it a useful source?
>>> ii. Is the information reliable?
>>> iii. Is this source biased or objective?
>> iii. Reflect
>>> i. How does the source help you shape your understanding of the subject?
>>> ii. Has the source changed how you think about the subject?
>
> Additional details are available from OWL (the Purdue Online Writing Lab) at https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/614/01/
>
> b. Co-plan class assigned to your research cluster, assisted by prof.
>> i. Establish the breadth and boundaries to be covered;
>> ii. Plan learning objectives for the class;

---

[9] Research clusters that occur earlier in the semester may post preliminary resources to the page and update it as the semester advances. Those presenting later in the term may wish to begin posting early and update as their research continues and deepens.

      iii. Plan methods by which students will engage with the subject (reading, lectures, collaborative learning exercises, games, discussions)

      iv. Assign readings

c. Class will include individual presentations of each student's research in progress.

      i. Students present earlier in the semester will be at earlier phases of their research.

Rubric

	Absent (0-105 pts.)	Beginning 106-120	Developing 121-124	Accomplished 125-135	Exemplary 136-150
Co-planning of class with professor – Team (25 pts.)	Students haven't made contact or have simply listed suggestions without assisting in integrating the information with appropriate techniques for the topic for the day. (0-17 pts.)	Students simply listed suggestions with limited assistance in integrating the information with appropriate techniques for the topic for the day. (18-19 pts.)	Students have demonstrated the meaning of the material by correctly incorporating it into the topic of study for the day. Efforts were made to think about appropriate means for exploring topic as a class. (20-21 pts.)	Students have defined high-level questions to organize exploration of topic. Students have demonstrated expertise with the material by identifying appropriate means for exploring topic as a class. (23-24 pts.)	Students have defined high-level questions to organize exploration of topic. Students have demonstrated expertise by correctly elaborating, extending and explaining the information and incorporating it into the assigned class. (25 pts.)
Contributions to resources page – Team (50 pts.)	Gathered information is incomplete and does not include the basics of the topic. (0-36 pts.)	Gathered information includes some of the basics. (37-40 pts.)	Gathered information includes the basics. (41-44 pts.)	Gathered information includes the basics of the topic and an in-depth study has begun. (45-47 pts.)	Gathered information includes the basics of the topic and an in-depth study of the topic. (48-50 pts.)

Presentation of your research to date (75 pts.)	Student does not have a good grasp of the information. Student cannot answer basic questions about the subject.	Student is uncomfortable with information and is able to answer only basic questions about the subject.	Student demonstrates a basic knowledge but lacks the ability to fully expound the topic.	Student demonstrates a sufficient knowledge but does not have the ability to fully expound the topic.	Student demonstrates a deep knowledge and has the ability to fully expound the topic.
	Student present without any coherent sequence to follow, losing most of the audience.	Student demonstrates coherence in topics but frequently jumps back and forth between them, making it hard for many in the audience to follow.	Student demonstrates coherence in topics but occasionally jumps back and forth between them, making it hard for some audience members to follow.	Student presents information in a logical, coherent sequence which the audience can follow.	Student presents information in a logical, coherent interesting sequence which audience can easily follow.
	Slides are cluttered, disorganized, containing multiple mistakes and errors.	Slides are unclear and include multiple errors.	Slides are mostly clear, including some elements that may be confusing and includes multiple typos or mistakes.	Slides are mostly clear, but include some elements that may be confusing or includes several typos or mistakes.	Slides are clear, organized and consistent with presentation, free from typos and errors.
	Student mumbles, speaks too softly for even the front of the room to hear, or just sounds bored with the presentation.	Student does not speak so that the whole room can hear and speaks without enough inflection or enunciation.	Student does not speak so that the whole room can hear and speaks without enough inflection or enunciation.	Student speaks clearly enough for all, but could still use more inflection or enunciation.	Student speaks clearly enough for all, projecting enthusiasm through inflection and enunciation.
	(0-53 pts.)	(54-60 pts.)	(61-66 pts.)	(67-72 pts.)	(73- 75 pts.)

Information Literacy Frame: Scholarship as conversation

Knowledge practices and dispositions: Learners who are developing their information literate abilities cite the contributing work of others in their own information production and contribute to scholarly conversation at an appropriate level, such as local online community.

- recognize that they are often entering an ongoing scholarly conversation and not a finished conversation;
- seek out conversations taking place in their research area;
- see themselves as contributors to scholarship rather than only consumers of it;
- understand the responsibility that comes with entering the conversation through participatory channels; and

- recognize that systems privilege authorities and that not having a fluency in the language and process of a discipline.

10. **Policy brief**, 350 pts.

      Using guidelines, students will prepare an 18-page written policy brief.
        a. Prepare draft,
        b. Participate in peer-review, and
        c. Submit final policy brief.

POLICY BRIEF: Guidelines

Useful sites: http://www2.maxwell.syr.edu/plegal/tips/select.html
http://www.american.edu/cas/writing/pdf/upload/Writing-a-Policy-Analysis.pdf
https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/~i382l5pd/su2003/suggestions.html

You are to prepare a policy brief on a topic of your choice. Your brief should introduce an issue related to cultural policy, describe what the relevant policy choices are, and then argue why one of those choices is superior to the others. Your brief should make use of published articles in economics, law, and policy journals (especially those dedicated to arts and culture), as well as government reports, other policy briefs, or news articles. However, since the goal of your brief is to inform and influence policy decisions, it is very important that it be understandable to a broad audience. How credible your brief is hinges on both how thorough your understanding of the relevant academic literature is and how careful you are in making your subject accessible to a general audience.

You are to choose your own topic, subject to two constraints. One, while you may choose a topic that we discuss in class, I will grade your brief primarily on its discussion of material **beyond** that which was discussed in class and as built throughout the preceding tasks. Two, the topic must have relevance to arts and culture.
Some things to keep in mind:
1. When in doubt, narrow your topic. It is far easier to expand a seemingly small subject than to adequately summarize a vast subject.
2. The number of academic papers you will cite depends on how large the literature is and how much information you are putting in your brief about each paper. A brief that cites only a couple of papers will not be credible.

Your final project should include the following sections:
- Introduction
  - Importance of specific topic
  - Definition of key terms
  - Key stakeholders
  - Key policy areas needing analysis and resolution
- Overview of current knowledge

- o Evaluative review of the literature about the topic, including print and electronic sources
- Existing policy related to the topic
  - o The most important legislative, judicial, and regulatory instruments
  - o Ambiguities, conflicts, problems, and contradictions to the instruments
- Key issues
  - o Underlying assumptions
  - o Effects on and roles of key stake holders
  - o Conflict among key values
  - o Implications of issues
- Conclusions and recommendations
  - o Recommendations
  - o Rationale for recommendations
  - o Implications and possible outcomes of specific courses of action
- References
  - o APA style (or other appropriate academic citation system)
  - o All sources cited in the paper

Rubric: Policy Brief (350 points)

	Absent (0-250 pts.)	Beginning (251-280 pts.)	Developing (281-290 pts.)	Accomplished (291-315 pts.)	Exemplary (316-350 pts.)
Introduction 45 pts.	The introduction, if present, has multiple flaws and errors in its purpose to introduce the subject of the brief clearly, engage the reader, and offer an overview of the brief (0-31 pts.)	The introduction is present but is unclear and may not engage the reader or offer reason to continue reading, or fails to offer an overview of the brief. (32-35 pts.)	The introduction is generally clear but offers summary some information that is insufficient to engage the reader. The intro. may not offer a map of the brief (36-38 pts.)	The introduction is clear and presents a thesis and an overview of the rest of the brief. (39-41 pts.)	The introduction is clear. It offers a thesis, hooks the reader by summarizing the significance of the brief, and serves as a guide to the rest of the paper. (42-45 pts.)
Overview 60 pts.	The brief fails to provide an overview of the policy problem and lacks foundation for subsequent analysis and recommendations (0-42 pts.)	The brief fails to provide **sufficient** overview of the policy problem and provides limited foundation for subsequent analysis and recommendations (43-48 pts.)	The brief summarizes the existing literature on the policy area but the argument for the contributions of this brief may be unclear, limited, or missing. The overview is generally organized but may have lapses that limit reader understanding. (49-51 pts.)	The brief summarizes the existing literature on the policy area. It explains how it helps to fill a need, but is limited in how well it does this. The overview is generally organized but may have some lapses that do not interfere with understanding (52-56 pts.)	The paper/report clearly and logically summarizes the existing literature on the policy area. It identifies gaps or limitations in the literature, and explains how this brief helps to fill a need. (57-60 pts.)
Existing policy 60 pts.	The brief offers insufficient review of existing policy. It may fail to evaluate the success/failure of the existing policy in addressing the problem. Opinions of the assessment are not supported. (0-42 pts.)	The brief offers insufficient review of existing policy. Its evaluation of the success/failure of the existing policy is limited and support for opinion(s) offered is insufficient (43-48 pts.)	The paper/report reviews relevant existing policy but does not offer sufficient breadth and detail. The success and/or limitations of the policy in addressing the problem are not clear and supported. (49-51 pts.)	The paper/report reviews relevant existing policy and evaluates the success and/or limitations of these in addressing the problem. There may be minor lapses in organization or clarity that do not interfere with reader understanding. (52-56 pts.)	The paper/report clearly, logically, and succinctly reviews relevant existing policy and evaluates the success and/or limitations of these in addressing the problem. Evaluation is supported with evidence. (57-60 pts.)

Key issues 60 pts.	The brief identifies some underlying assumptions, reports the effect on and roles of some key stakeholders, introduces some conflict among values and implications of these issues in general but leaves out more than one of these areas (0-42 pts.)	The brief identifies underlying assumptions, reports the effect on and roles of key stakeholders, introduces conflict among values and implications of these issues in limited detail but leaves out one of these areas (43-48 pts.)	The brief identifies some of the underlying assumptions, the effect on and roles of key stakeholders, conflict among values, and implications of these issues in limited detail. (49-5 pts.)	The brief clearly identifies the underlying assumptions, the effect on and roles of key stakeholders, conflict among values, and implications of these issues in an articulate and clear fashion. (52-56 pts.)	The brief clearly identifies the underlying assumptions, the effect on and roles of key stakeholders, conflict among values, and implications of these issues clearly, logically, and persuasively for the reader (57-60 pts.)
Conclusions/ Recommendations 65 pts.	The brief lacks thoughtful recommendations appropriate to the problem presented in the case. There are significant lapses in the organization and/or connection to key points made throughout the paper. (0-38 pts.)	Brief includes recommendations but does not explain the logic behind them. Analysis of the implications and possible outcomes is limited or missing. There are significant lapses in the organization and/or connection to key points made throughout the paper. (39-44 pts.)	The brief includes recommendations but does not sufficiently explain the logic behind these. Analysis of the implications and possible outcomes is present but limited. There are lapses in the organization and/or connection to key points made throughout the paper. (45-51 pts.)	The brief includes recommendations and rationale, analyzes the implications, and presents possible outcomes. There are slight lapses in the organization or connection to key points made throughout the paper. (52-57 pts.)	The brief includes recommendations, including rationale, and analyzes the implications and possible outcomes. This is done clearly and logically, offering support for the argument that was laid out throughout the report. (58-65 pts.)
Organization, Spelling, Grammar, Formatting 30 pts.	Errors in grammar and format that present significant barriers to understanding authors meaning. (0-46 pts.)	Errors in grammar and /or format that present limited barriers to understanding authors meaning. (47-52 pts.)	Some errors in grammar and/or format that do not interfere with communication. (53-55- pts.)	Few errors in grammar or relative to length and complexity. Paper is organized and easy to follow. (56-60 pts.)	Writing is free from almost all errors. Paper is organized and tightly written to communicate substantial material in a concise space (61-65 pts.)
Quality and use of references 30 pts.	There are virtually no sources that are academically or professionally reliable and author may have included various unofficial websites. References are seldom used to support statements in paper. (0-17pts.)	There are few academically or professionally reliable and author may have included unofficial websites. The reader doubts the accuracy of the material presented. Authors uses a limited number of citations to support statements. (18-20pts.)	Most of the references are from reliable sources but not from those that are academic and peer-reviewed. The reader is left looking for deeper and more substantive evidence of the claims. Attributions are occasionally given to claims made in paper. (21-23 pts.)	Although most of the references are from academically legitimate sources, a few are questionable. The reliability of some sources is uncertain. Attribution/citation is mostly clear. (24-26 pts.)	References are from academically legitimate sources. The reader is confident that the information can be trusted. Compelling evidence from legitimate sources is given to support claims. Attribution is clear and fairly represented. (27-30 pts.)

Information Literacy Frame: Scholarship as conversation

Knowledge practices and dispositions: Learners who are developing their information literate abilities cite the contributing work of others in their own information production and contribute to scholarly conversation at an appropriate level, such as local online community.

- recognize that they are often entering an ongoing scholarly conversation and not a finished conversation;
- seek out conversations taking place in their research area;
- see themselves as contributors to scholarship rather than only consumers of it;
- understand the responsibility that comes with entering the conversation through participatory channels; and
- recognize that systems privilege authorities and that not having a fluency in the language and process of a discipline.