

University of Mary Washington

Eagle Scholar

Interdisciplinary

College of Arts and Sciences

1-2021

Supporting Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning in the Classroom

Leslie Martin

P. Anand Rao

Adrienne Brovero

Gonzalo Campos-Dintrans

Steve Greenlaw

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.umw.edu/interdisciplinary>



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

Authors

Leslie Martin, P. Anand Rao, Adrienne Brovero, Gonzalo Campos-Dintrans, Steve Greenlaw, Pamela R. Grothe, Jason Hayob-Matzke, Jodie Hayob-Matzke, Christine Henry, Joseph Romero, and Andrea Livi Smith



Supporting Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning in the Classroom

UMW Faculty Learning Community
January 2021

Recommended citation:

Martin, Leslie, Rao, P. Anand, Brovero, Adrienne, Campos-Dintrans, Gonzalo, Greenlaw, Steve, Grothe, Pamela, Hayob-Matzke, Jason, Hayob-Matzke, Jodie, Henry, Christine, Romero, Joseph, and Smith, Andréa Livi (2021). *Course Materials to Support Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning*. UMW Faculty Learning Community, University of Mary Washington: Fredericksburg, Virginia.



We live, teach and learn in complicated times. As faculty in higher education, we have the opportunity to help uphold the civic purpose of higher education. We are accustomed to helping students navigate academic information, and to equipping them for more standard academic tasks. Through thoughtful course design, we can also help our students become better consumers and evaluators of less traditionally academic information: from critically interpreting what they read and see in the news media, to engaging the arguments of their friends, peers and family members. Further, we can challenge our students to use these evaluative skills to engage in debate and advocacy activities around critical issues of the day.

Such was the motivation for the UMW “Advocacy, Deliberation and Civic Learning” faculty learning community. Eleven faculty across a range of disciplines met regularly from January through June 2020. We started with a workshop led by Dr. Lynn Pelco of VCU, focused on defining key concepts, and thinking through how they connected with each other. We spent the next several months reading inspiring articles, poring over VALUE rubrics from AAC&U, and sharing our ideas with each other for incorporating these new pedagogical approaches into our coursework.

What follows is a compilation of the assignments created from this learning community. Many of us switched assignments & even courses to focus on as the community went on, and as the pandemic forced us to think about how to incorporate this work into online environments.

Our hope is that other faculty can find some ideas from our work, can identify a jumping off point for their own exploration of what it means to be “civic” in our teaching, and how both debate & advocacy can provide opportunities for students to hone their critical thinking & effective communication skills.

Leslie Martin, PhD
Associate Professor of Sociology
Faculty Director, Center for Community Engagement

P. Anand Rao, PhD
Professor of Communication
Director, Speaking Intensive Program

Table of Contents

COMM 481: Policy Debate Practicum (Adrienne Brovero)	1
FSEM 100R5: Opportunities and Challenges of the Multilingual Community (Gonzalo Campos-Dintrans)	5
FSEM 100N: Economic Inequality & the American Dream (Steve Greenlaw)	9
EESC 355: Icehouse-Greenhouse Earth (Pamela Grothe)	12
PHIL 325: Philosophy of Law II (Jason Hayob-Matzke)	15
EESC 112: Evolution of the Earth (Jodie Hayob-Matzke)	19
HIPS 471-A3: Special Topics - Diversity in Preservation (Christine Henry)	21
SOCG 400: Public Sociology (Leslie Martin)	23
COMM 460: Seminar in Digital Rhetoric (Anand Rao)	25
CLAS 105: Roman Civilization (Joseph Romero)	29
HISP 209: Planning History and Practice (Andréa Livi Smith)	31

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	COMM 481: Policy Debate Practicum
Discipline	Communication Studies
Course level	Undergraduate
Enrollment	10-15
Faculty instructor	Adrienne Brovero
Faculty contact	abrovero@umw.edu

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

The course is for students to receive credit for satisfactory work on the University’s intercollegiate policy debate team. Students are required to compete in at least three intercollegiate debate tournaments (budget permitting) during the semester. Students participate in a minimum of 18 debates against students from other colleges and universities. In each debate, students are expected to deliver a 9-minute speech in which they present their own arguments, and a 6-minute speech in which they refute their opponent’s arguments. In addition, each student also conducts a 3-minute oral cross-examination of their opponent, and each student is also the respondent in a 3-minute cross-examination by their opponent. In each of these 18 debates, students are offered extensive feedback, both orally and in writing by their judges. Judges are trained critics from other colleges and universities who have diverse, but extensive, backgrounds in intercollegiate debate. Students are expected to participate in weekly meetings, research, strategy sessions, and practice debates, before and after traveling to tournaments.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

Multi-part media literacy unit to improve students’ abilities to both conduct their own research and critically evaluate research (their own and opponents’) for debate purposes. The five activities will be spaced out across the semester. The “Why Evidence?” and the “Scope and Impact of Fake News” activities will be completed early in the semester, optimally before the first tournament, to help students appreciate and analyze the use of evidence in debates. The “Tactics” and “Evaluating Evidence” activities will be completed mid-semester, as students begin their own research. “Applying the Skills” will be completed at the end of the semester to give students a toolkit to use in everyday life, beyond the course and competitions.

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

Civic Engagement Learning Outcomes

Content-Related

- Critical inquiry, analysis, reasoning
- Gathering and evaluating multiple sources of evidence
- Seeking, engaging, and being informed by multiple perspectives

Process-Related

- Written, oral, and multi-media communication
- Collaborative decision making
- Deliberation and bridge building across differences

Assessment of Outcomes

- Media literacy quizzes in which students evaluate credibility of various news items based on criteria.
- Application of toolkits to both everyday news (social media item) and debate evidence (a piece of research presented in a debate). A rubric will be used to evaluate efficacy of application of the toolkit in each instance.

Media Literacy

Topic 1: Why Evidence?

Activity

Flipgrid Video Projects –

- 3-minute speech
- May not cite any research/sources.
- Prove the resolution without evidence:
 - Resolved: The US should terminate its defense pact with NATO.

Discussion, after viewing speeches

- Why do we need evidence?
- Why do we want evidence?
- What do we learn from evidence?

Topic 2: Scope & Impact of Fake News

Scope

Both in society and in debate

Impact

Examples – COVID, Bots, Pizzagate, Vaccinations

Topic 3: Tactics of Fake News

Make Fake News

As a class, collectively play this news manipulation game, in which the player generates fake news, in order to facilitate discussion and of and inoculation from propaganda/fake news tactics - <https://www.getbadnews.com/#next>.

Discussion

- What tactics are used?
- Why do they work?
- How will we guard against them in the future?

Topic 4: Evaluating Evidence & Identifying Fake News

Evaluating Evidence

Discussion of rubrics for critically evaluating news items

- CRAAP – Currency, Relevance, Authority, Accuracy, Purpose
- ESCAPE (Newseum) – Evidence, Source, Context, Audience, Purpose, Execution

Assessment

Quiz - <http://factitious.augamestudio.com/#/> (also Pandemic edition)

Topic 5: Applying the Skills

Developing Our Toolkits Discussion

- Everyday toolkit – Set of tools/criteria to efficiently evaluate everyday news items (e.g. social media, cable news stories, etc.).
- Debate toolkit – Set of tools/criteria to efficiently evaluate debate research when working on arguments and strategies and when debating in competition.

Assessment

Flipgrid Video Projects – **two** 3-minute speeches:

- Apply the Everyday Toolkit to a social media item from today

Apply the Debate Toolkit to a critique or defend a piece of debate evidence

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	First Year Seminar: Opportunities and Challenges of the Multilingual Community
Discipline	Linguistics
Course level	First Year
Enrollment	15
Faculty instructor	Gonzalo Campos-Dintrans
Faculty contact	gcamposd@umw.edu

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

In this first-year seminar, students learn how language policies shape language rights, and how local and national laws promote or hinder certain languages or language varieties, both in the United States and abroad. Some of the materials discussed in class include essays, book chapters and articles on the discussion about making English the official language of the USA, bilingual education, and sign language, among others.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

Students will engage in two small group debate activities during the semester. Both activities are identical in format, but the issues discussed will be different. In each debate, one group will be arguing *for* a position, and the opposing team will be arguing *against* such position. At the end of the semester students will compose a message meant for a state representative about a current state bill.

Towards the end of the semester students will be asked to choose a cause they would like to advocate for, hopefully related to language at the state level. They will compose a message to their representatives and explain their view on the issue (either supporting or opposing). Whether they actually send it or not is up to them. Additionally, they will be asked to find other ways to advocate for their cause, for example, by finding a local or national organization that they would like to support or participate in.

The debate activity will be assessed on mainly three criteria: delivery, content and time. Performance is graded both individually and by group, that is, a student's grade will be the average of her/his performance and her/his group. A detailed rubric can be found at the end of this course description.

Assessment of the message for the representative(s) will be based on:

Use of language: punctuation, spelling, tone
Content: ideas are supported with trustworthy sources
Fluency: the sequence of ideas helps the reader understand the message
Structure: the message has a clear introduction, development and conclusion

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

Two of the learning outcomes of the class are a) to take a position, based on knowledge, discussion and reflection, on language policies, and b) to follow a course of action in the real world designed to advocate for their position on language issues. Learning outcome (a) involves familiarity with current issues related to language policies, discussed either locally or nationally. The preparation during the semester aims at providing students with enough background information about how these issues have taken place in the United States and elsewhere, and how language rights have been both promoted and curbed. Civic learning in this course takes this a step further by requiring knowing what is currently being discussed in terms of language policy at the state and national level, and knowing how to advocate for the position students believe in.

Including debate as a learning activity is meant to provide students with opportunities to:

- a) examine their previous assumptions and understanding
- b) gather, interpret, and examine different sources of information, and
- c) collaboratively construct new meaning, within each team, but also through the debate activity

Although these can also be developed through writing assignments, the format of the debate affords a very tangible and interactive audience (the opposing team), whose role is to examine and counter the presenter's statements. An audience of this type helps students to both deepen and widen their understanding of the issues.

Format of the debates

A week before the scheduled debate, students will be assigned to their groups as well as to the position they will support. With a class size of 15 students, there would be three groups of 4 students, and one group of 3 students. During a 50-minute class period, there will be enough time for all students to debate the same day. Here is the structure of the debate.

Group A (**for**) makes their opening statement: 2-3 minutes

Group B (**against**) makes their opening statement: 2-3 minutes

-Time for each group to convene: 2 minutes

Group A addresses one idea from the other group: 2-3 minutes

Group 2 addresses one idea from the other group: 2-3 minutes

-Time for each group to convene: 2 minutes

Group A makes closing comment: 1-2 minutes

Group B makes closing comment: 1-2 minutes

-Open questions from the audience: up to 5 minutes

Topics of the debates

For the first debate:

The USA should have English as its official language: **for** and **against**

The USA should have English and Spanish as co-official languages: **for** and **against**

For the second debate, the two discussions will be based on current or recent issues at the state level, for example, Virginia Senate Bill 323.

FSEM 100R5: Opportunities and Challenges of the Multilingual Community

Debate Activity Rubric

	Poor	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations
Time (10%)	Finished much before established time, or well over the limit		Finished within the allotted time	
Delivery (40%): pace, voice volume, body language, acknowledgement of the audience and the other debate team	Delivery is such that it distracts the audience, and it is hard to follow overall.	Pace is somewhat too fast or too slow, there are no pauses, or they are too long. Voice volume is low making it hard to follow No acknowledgment of the audience either at the beginning, end, or both	Pace is appropriate, it facilitates understanding Voice volume is adequate. Nonverbal cues help delivery Appropriate acknowledgment of the audience	Fluid delivery, nonverbal language, volume, pace, beginning and end effectively engage the audience
Content (50%)	Statements are not supported. Mostly opinion and anecdotal evidence.	Statements are somewhat supported, they still make sense	Statements are well supported	Statements are strongly supported
	Little or no connection between ideas	A few ideas do not follow logically	Ideas are logically sequenced; transitions are mostly effective	Ideas are impeccably sequenced, and transitions are seamless
	No summary at the end of main point	Summary is provided but it is not comprehensive	Main point of the presentation is effectively summarized	Summary of presentation is concise and persuasive
	No acknowledgement of the other group's points	Counterargument is somewhat acknowledged and addressed	Counterargument is acknowledged and addressed	Counterargument is strong, and yet effectively addressed

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	Economic Inequality & the American Dream
Discipline	FSEM 100n
Course level	100
Enrollment	15
Faculty instructor	Steve Greenlaw
Faculty contact	sgreenla@umw.edu

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

I teach a First Year Seminar on Economic Inequality. The FSEM counts for our Honors program, so my students tend to be quite good. All our FSEMs provide an introduction to college-level writing, oral communication, and research skills, though the subject of each FSEM differs across the curriculum. My FSEM includes a variety of readings, including two books: One presenting a liberal perspective on inequality and the other presenting a conservative perspective. It also includes formal and informal writing, formal and informal speaking activities, and a research project.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

The issue of inequality provides a great opportunity to incorporate advocacy, deliberation, and civic learning activities. My project, narrowly defined, is to add a formal debate on the question: "Does economic inequality threaten U.S. democracy?" We will start with a one class-session town hall debate to introduce students to the concept of debate. Following this short debate, we will debrief to identify what went well and what could be improved. For the formal debate, students will research both sides of the question, presenting their findings as a written draft. Then we will prepare a formal debate, conducted asynchronously over five calendar days (see attached assignment). Finally, I will ask each student to draw personal conclusions about the Question, by writing a revised version of their research paper draft.

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

Learning Outcomes for the Project:

(Modified from AAC&U CE Value Rubric on Civic Engagement)

- **Diversity of Attitudes** - Demonstrates evidence of awareness of diverse perspectives and adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures

- **Analysis of Knowledge** – Demonstrates understanding of the issues: Economic inequality, democracy and the theory & evidence about how they are or are not related. Deliberation on the question. Drawing a conclusion.
- **Civic Communication Skills** – Express, active listening, adapt ideas & messages from others' perspectives.

I plan to assess student achievement of these learning outcomes by reviewing their final research papers and comparing them to their draft papers before the debate.

Formal Debate Assignment

The debate will be conducted asynchronously over five calendar days in teams of two. One student will make the affirmative case; the other will make the negative case. The presentations will be video recorded, rather than presented live.

Day 1: Both Debaters

- Affirmative Constructive – 7mins
- Cross Examination – 2mins

The pair of debaters meet on Zoom, and the affirmative speaker gives their first speech, presenting at least three main points in favor of the question for seven mins. Next, the affirmative speaker will respond to two minutes of questions from the negative debater. The affirmative speaker is responsible for setting up the recording and posting it on the Canvas Discussion board by 5:00pm.

Day 2: Both Debaters

- Negative Constructive – 7 mins
- Cross Examination – 2 mins

Like the first day, but this time the negative speaker gives their first speech, presenting at least three points against the question, for seven mins; after which the affirmative speaker asks questions for two minutes. The negative speaker is responsible for setting up the recording and posting it on the Canvas Discussion board by 5pm.

Day 3: Affirmative Rebuttal – 4 mins

The affirmative speaker gives their rebuttal, responding to the arguments made by the negative speaker, in this two-minute speech. They must post their recording by 5pm.

Day 4: Negative Rebuttal – 4 mins

Like Day 3, but with the negative speaker giving their speech for four minutes, responding to the affirmative rebuttal. They must post their recording by 5pm.

Day 5: Closing Statements

Both Debaters present a one-and-a-half-minute closing speech. What do you want the audience to remember about your argument? Each debater is responsible for posting their own recording by 5pm.

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	Icehouse-Greenhouse Earth
Discipline	Earth and Environmental Sciences
Course level	EESC 355
Enrollment	18 Students
Faculty instructor	Pamela Grothe
Faculty contact	pgrothe@umw.edu

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

This course examines the history of the Earth’s climate system in the context of the two primary modes: Icehouse and Greenhouse. Through critical evaluation of primary literature, written assignments and oral presentations, students will gain an appreciation of the magnitude of temporal and spatial climate reorganizations through time and develop an in-depth understanding of both long- and short-term cyclic changes that have contributed to the development of our modern climate system.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

The goal of the advocacy activity is to educate an audience using science-based evidence to dispel common myths about climate change that are often used by the conservative media. Within this framework, students should also be prepared to indicate the urgency of the situation and provide examples of things their audience members could do to help, all while being sensitive to audience needs and concerns.

Students will have several smaller assignments leading up to this that will prepare them and make them more comfortable speaking to more general audiences. Smaller assignments include a class brainstorming session on climate myths, individual research on the myths, and a mini debate on the myths where students will also have to play devils advocate. The course content will provide the scientific background they need to bring the science-based reasoning to their advocacy activity.

As a follow-up assignment to the advocacy activity, students will be required to write a short reflection paper on their experience, including feedback received from their audience and what they learned to move forward in becoming advocates for climate.

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

Course Learning Outcomes the Assignment Meets:

1. Gather and evaluate multiple sources of evidence related to changes in our past climate in order to construct science-based reasoning to communicate evidence for human-induced warming.
2. Feel empowered to value your responsibility to a larger good in communicating climate science to your community and advocating for social change.

Learning Outcomes Related to Civic Learning and Engagement

1. Understanding one's sources of identity and their influence on civic values, assumptions, and responsibilities to a wider public
2. Critical inquiry, analysis, and reasoning
3. Gathering and evaluating multiple sources of evidence
4. Written, oral, and multi-media communication
5. Responsibility to a larger good
6. Integration of knowledge, skills, and examined values to inform actions taken in concert with other people
7. Compromise, civility, and mutual respect

Assessment

Students will complete a self-assessment through the short reflection paper they write following the advocacy assignment. They will be provided a "rubric", or questions to think about as they reflect on what they learned.

Sample Questions for Reflection Assessment – note that not all will be relevant, depending on the modality of their activity:

1. Do you think you engaged with the audience's emotions? Did you help them see that understanding this problem and its solution is important?
2. Did you use direct language? Did you avoid jargon, or explain any unusual terms you used?
3. How was your delivery? Did you look at your listeners, move around with gestures, did you feel natural (why or why not)? Were you confident? Passionate?
4. How well did you identify the nature and scope of the problem?
5. Do you think you convinced your audience of the necessity for action? Did you articulate clear solutions for them?
6. Did you provide evidence that shows the need for solutions and action? Did you provide a thoughtful analysis of the problem?
7. If you used visuals, how well do you think it enhanced the argument?
8. How well do you feel you answered your audiences' questions? Did you feel engaged with their questions? Were you comfortable saying, "I don't know..." if you did not know the answer?

Advocacy Assignment Description:

Advocate for Climate!

The hottest topic of the 21st century is climate change, no pun intended. We are facing a climate catastrophe and we must implement solutions immediately in order to reduce climate-related impacts. However, this is challenging to do in a society where we have had a national leader who denied the scientific arguments behind man-caused climate change. Even though many Americans believe that climate change is real, they either do not see it as pressing or they are confused about the science from people spreading misinformation.

Students will choose one event or avenue where they can advocate for climate change using science-based evidence. There will be considerable amount of flexibility and examples provided as well as adaptations for 100% virtual opportunities, due to COVID-19. Students will also have the opportunity to work in groups to complete the advocacy assignment.

Examples of opportunities include but are not limited to the following:

- Tabling an on-campus event
- Volunteering to speak at an event or to an organization the student is involved with
- Providing public comment to their city council
- Teaching a climate-related lesson to students in K-12
- Writing an opinion letter to the local paper
- Creating a podcast, narrated graphic or video to share broadly
- Writing a blog post to share broadly

Sample Questions for Reflection Assessment

Note that not all will be relevant, depending on the modality of their activity:

9. Do you think you engaged with the audience's emotions? Did you help them see that understanding this problem and its solution is important?
10. Did you use direct language? Did you avoid jargon, or explain any unusual terms you used?
11. How was your delivery? Did you look at your listeners, move around with gestures, did you feel natural (why or why not)? Were you confident? Passionate?
12. How well did you identify the nature and scope of the problem?
13. Do you think you convinced your audience of the necessity for action? Did you articulate clear solutions for them?
14. Did you provide evidence that shows the need for solutions and action? Did you provide a thoughtful analysis of the problem?
15. If you used visuals, how well do you think it enhanced the argument?

How well do you feel you answered your audiences' questions? Did you feel engaged with their questions? Were you comfortable saying, "I don't know..." if you did not know the answer?

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	PHIL 325: Philosophy of Law II
Discipline	Philosophy
Course level	300-level
Enrollment	25
Faculty instructor	Jason Hayob-Matzke
Faculty contact	jmatzke@umw.edu

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

PHIL 325: *Philosophy of Law II* is an upper level Philosophy course covering philosophical and ethical issues in criminal and tort law. It is part of UMW's pre-law curriculum and enrolls a mix of Philosophy majors and nonmajors.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

An important aspect of the common law's adversarial approach is that although most members of the court are expected to square the legal outcome with the factual truth, the defense attorney is obligated to protect the defendant against the prosecutorial power of the state. This "different mission" of the defense attorney does not allow for outright lying, forging documents, or prodding others to lie, but it does allow—and even encourages—behavior that might seem to come awfully close to lying.

In "The Criminal Lawyer's 'Different Mission': Reflections on the 'Right' to Present a False Case,"

Harry Subin provides a case study that highlights the difficult moral position of the defense attorney. The case involves a serious sexual crime and a defense attorney (the author himself) who has not only become certain that his client committed the crime, but who cannot advance a defense unless he advances a so-called false case. He describes in detail how his false defense would not run afoul of current legal ethics and expectations, but would nonetheless be, to his mind, morally offensive. False defenses, he argues, should not be allowed.

The case raises several serious questions: If the defense attorney is to no longer mislead in the ways Subin finds objectionable (but law currently allows), what is he or she to do instead? Would failure to do all the law currently allows (ethics aside) amount to an abridgment of the client's rights to a rigorous defense? Where, and how, should the line be drawn between acceptable and unacceptable attempts to mislead a jury? A second, more general, set of questions also arises: Why should we prefer the adversarial system over a more cooperative one? Is the power of the state so overwhelming that a defense attorney

must advance a false defense if this is the only avenue available to protect her client? Are there ways of altering the adversarial approach such that we can protect defendants from the state while avoiding the potentially immoral actions expected of defense attorneys?

A Roundtable on Policy

Students will be divided into four groups of five, with each group assigned to one of the following positions (A and B are in contrast with one another, as are C and D):

A. A defense attorney *should* be allowed to knowingly advance a false defense in a case such as the one Subin describes.

Vs.

B. A defense attorney *should not* be allowed to knowingly advance a false defense in a case such as the one Subin describes.

AND

C. The adversarial approach, in which a defense attorney has wide latitude to deceive short of outright lying, encouraging others to lie, and creating false documents, is the best way to i) protect defendants from the power of the state and/or ii) arrive at verdicts that best match factual truth.

Vs.

D. Something needs to change—the use of the adversarial approach, the expectations of the defense attorney’s “different mission,” or other elements of the criminal justice system—in order to better achieve the goals of i) protecting defendants from the power of the state and/or ii) arriving at verdicts that best match factual truth.

Each group will develop a set of policies regarding either defense attorney behavior specifically (groups A and B) or the criminal justice system more generally (groups C and D), and arguments for each policy. At least five recommendations should be developed by each group. Arguments supporting these policies are to be rationally plausible and coherent, not merely psychologically persuasive, and they cannot merely be versions of “the law currently says X, so X is correct.” Policy proposals may include already existing policies.

Each group will share a copy of their proposals and arguments with everyone else in the class at least two days prior to their scheduled in-class presentation and roundtable discussion.

Groups A and B will present their results orally to the class and will then engage together in a roundtable effort to arrive at a negotiated outcome—a set of policies both sides can accept as rationally defensible even if it is not everything each side wants (this needn’t be a splitting-the-difference sort of compromise, and should depend on the strength of the arguments).

Groups C and D will do the same during a subsequent scheduled class meeting.

Wrap-up:

Following this exercise, each student will write up his or her observations. This can be as short as a page or two (double-spaced) and will include a description of how they experienced each of these roundtable discussions—one of which they participated in themselves. How well did the roundtable work as a way of arriving at reasonable conclusions? Were rational arguments or mere psychological maneuvers used, and were either used effectively? Are you happy with the results in the sense that you can—and you think others can too—embrace them without sacrificing commitments to rationality, fairness, and justice? Why or why not?

Readings:

1. Harry Subin. "The Criminal Lawyer's 'Different Mission': Reflections on the 'Right' to Present a False Case." In: Ethan M. Katsh and William Rose, eds. *Clashing Views on Controversial Legal Issues*, 9th ed. Guilford, Conn.: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill, 2000. Pp. 62-77.
2. John B. Mitchell. "Reasonable Doubts Are Where You Find Them: A Response to Professor Subin's Position on the Criminal Lawyer's 'Different Mission.'" In: Ethan M. Katsh and William Rose, eds. *Clashing Views on Controversial Legal Issues*, 9th ed. Guilford, Conn.: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill, 2000. Pp. 78-89.
3. American Bar Association, "Criminal Justice Standards for the Defense Function," https://www.americanbar.org/groups/criminal_justice/standards/DefenseFunctionFourthEdition/
4. Joshua A. Liebman. "Dishonest Ethical Advocacy?: False Defenses in Criminal Court." *Fordham Law Review* vol. 85 no. 3 (2016): 1319-1353.

Any additional readings students use in the development of their positions should be shared with the class (the professor will facilitate this).

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

Learning Objectives:

This activity should help students:

- Understand the basic structure and aims of the adversarial criminal system
- Appreciate both sides of the ethical “false defense” controversy
- Form a position of one’s own on the ethical controversy and the larger adversarial system itself
- Become better engaged participants in a structured roundtable discussion seeking a policy compromise or consensus
- Develop skills of group deliberation grounded in reason and ethical values

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	EESC 112: Evolution of the Earth
Discipline	Earth and Environmental Science (EESC)
Course level	100-level; second semester introductory geology course
Enrollment	Each section is 24 students; faculty teach one, two, or three sections
Faculty instructor	Jodie Hayob-Matzke
Faculty contact	Jodie Hayob-Matzke

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

EESC 112 *Evolution of the Earth* is an introductory geology course, commonly called Historical Geology at other institutions. At UMW, EESC 112 includes historical geology (evolution of the Earth, continents, oceans and life through time) as well as more modern topics such as climate change (over geological timeframes as well as anthropogenic) and energy resources (esp. fossil fuels such as coal, petroleum, and natural gas). Most students find the content in the latter half of the course particularly relevant to their everyday lives; a central focus of the climate change discussions is the close relationship between human combustion fossil fuels since the Industrial Revolution and the dramatic rise of CO₂ in Earth's atmosphere. Thus, the proposed debate activity should be a good venue to engage students in their learning.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

Through a two-week laboratory activity, students will analyze a range of issues associated with drilling in Section 1002 of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) in Alaska and will present their results in a debate format.

Students will first complete a series of prescribed readings and answer a set of questions in Week 1 as background material. Visual aids such as maps of the region will also be provided. The rationale for providing these materials upfront is that EESC 112 is a 100-level course and the ANWR drilling issue is complex; providing readings from a variety of sources and maps ensures that all students are working with a common dataset at the outset. Students will also be provided with a list of additional resources to consult as they see fit.

Pairs of students will be assigned one of four different PRO drill, or one of four different anti-drill (CON) positions, representing eight viewpoints in total. There will be no winners or losers of the debates; rather students will be assessed based on the thoroughness of their presentations and effective arguments.

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

Learning Outcomes for the debate laboratory include the following:

Knowledge

- Promote well-informed citizens in a democratic society
- Enhance students' knowledge of the issues relevant to drilling in ANWR (economic, cultural, environmental, etc.)

Skills

- Enhance critical inquiry, analysis, and reasoning
- Increase ability to gather and evaluate multiple sources of evidence
- Enhance written and oral communication skills
- Promote deliberation and bridge-building across differences
- Promote collaborative decision making

Values

- Promote empathy for others (indigenous groups, impoverished and/or unemployed)
- Instill a sense of responsibility to a larger good (such as sustainability)
- Promote civility and mutual respect

Synergistic

- Assist students in acquiring skills necessary to engage in meaningful dialogue with minimal emotionalism
- Integrate knowledge, skills, and values to inform actions proposed or taken in concert with other stakeholders
- Public problem-solving with diverse partners

Assessment of debate performance will be determined based on the quality of data presented, including visual aids, and persuasiveness of arguments. A Debate Scoring Rubric will be provided to students in advance of the activity; peer review will be incorporated into the assessment process.

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	Special Topics Course: Diversity in Preservation
Discipline	Historic Preservation
Course level	471-A3 (not yet approved by curriculum committee)
Enrollment	12
Faculty instructor	Christine Henry
Faculty contact	Christine Henry

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

This is an upper level course for historic preservation majors where they are challenged to explore more deeply the history of this field and examine how cultural and methodological biases have resulted in a limited landscape that is preserved. Through readings, lectures, research, and in-depth discussion of current and classic scholarship, this course explores diversity of *voices, places, and methods* in historic preservation. This course is a seminar, but is run more like an architecture studio where the students work with a client who has a stated need and the students work collaboratively to create solutions to that design problem.

Historic preservation is an inherently public-facing endeavor, so woven throughout the course is the idea that what is preserved should be reflective of the larger society. We discuss ways to involve communities at the grass-roots level in order to create a more inclusive and multi-faceted historical narrative through the built environment. Each year the course tackles different topics, depending on community needs. In Fall 2020, students will collaborate with the James Farmer Multicultural Center and the Fredericksburg City Tourism Department to assist in the efforts to develop a Civil Rights History trail, recently funded by the City Council. The semester-long project will be to research sites around the city, develop preliminary narratives, and propose creative delivery methods particularly for young people—both locals and visitors to Fredericksburg.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

Students will develop an understanding of the foundational ideas of historic preservation practice and analyze how these practices have led to a historic record that many feel does not adequately represent the diversity of our population and experience. They will then explore new theoretical and methodological approaches to historic preservation and develop the ability to think critically about these practices. One new activity in the class will be a short debate about the National Register, which is seen by some preservationists as inherently elitist. Students will advocate for either revising or eliminating this key preservation tool in order to create a more inclusive interpretation of history.

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

The course outcomes will be measured through in-class activities like this debate, as well as through two student reflective essays that begin with an exploration of a site that has been meaningful to them personally and why, and then is followed by an analytic essay of how that site could be changed applying the ideas and methods they have learned through the class. These outcomes will also be assessed by evaluating the semester long project described above. While as an instructor I will be giving the grades, our client, the city of Fredericksburg, will also provide input on the assessment of meeting those outcomes based on how well the final projects meet their stated goals.

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	Public Sociology
Discipline	Sociology
Course level	400
Enrollment	20
Faculty instructor	Leslie Martin
Faculty contact	lmartin@umw.edu

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

Public Sociology is an elective for sociology majors and also serves as the capstone for the interdisciplinary Social Justice minor. After an introduction to the public sociology approach, students spend the bulk of the semester working in small groups to complete community-based applied research projects. They are provided with training in research methods & research ethics appropriate to their projects. Throughout the semester, students work with their community partners to be sure they understand the issue at hand, and that their research design meets with partner approval. At the end of the semester, they present final product and action plan for the future to their partners, and to me.

In the course of completing the project, the students often lose sight of how they can apply these skills and this approach to other issues, throughout their lives. It is for this reason that I will incorporate a focus on advocacy in this course.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

- a. In week 5 of the semester, after having explored examples of both traditionally academic and non-traditional, applied research projects, we do an in-class training on advocacy. The training will focus on what advocacy is, some basics on the structure of governance in the U.S., and some suggestions on how to voice desires and demands to political decision makers, and to potential allies.
- b. Following this training, students are asked to draft an advocacy plan based on an issue they feel passionate about. Students will be asked to brainstorm the issue of interest, possible goals they may have for creating short and long-term change on this issue. Additionally, students will try to create a “power map” for their issue, as discussed in the training. This process will ask them to identify possible allies and opponents on their issue, as well as how much decision-making influence they each may hold. Finally, they will be asked to sketch out a possible strategy for advocating on their issue. This will be their advocacy plan. Students will work in partners or small groups during the brainstorming portions of the exercise, and also to share their ideas.

c. Although they will then spend the next 10 weeks focused more completely on their group project, they will return to their advocacy plan at the end of the semester. They will take the knowledge, skills, and perspective gained by working on the applied research project to revise their advocacy plan. They will also annotate the revision, explaining what they changed and why.

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

The following learning outcomes are targeted by this assignment:

1. Develop an understanding of the levers of influence that citizens hold in a democracy to influence change; and an understanding of varied types and pathways to civic action in a democracy.

The advocacy training builds in discussions of how each of us can influence society and decision-makers. A successful advocacy assignment will reflect their understanding of decision-making in the relevant sphere of influence/at a specific level of governance.

2. Refine skills of critical thinking, inquiry, analysis; and gathering/evaluating multiple sources of information.

In order to complete the advocacy assignment, students will need to think deeply about their chosen issue. They will need to identify what element of the issue they want to focus advocacy efforts on, and will need to gather information to complete a relevant power map. Doing these tasks will require them to think about causal influences on their target issue, and to gather different kinds of information (from newspapers, talking with others, web research) to draw together an effective power map.

The course as a whole also seeks to achieve the following outcomes. If students work on advocacy project with a partner, they may be relevant here as well:

3. Practice public problem solving with diverse partners.

4. Seek and reflect on diverse perspectives; and explore civility and engagement across difference.

Students will discuss their issue and advocacy project with others in the class in groups of 3-4. They will share information and perspectives on the target issue that each member of the group focuses on. Students may not agree on these issues, and will need to learn how to work across difference effectively.

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	Seminar in Digital Rhetoric
Discipline	Communication
Course level	460 (upper level, capstone for Communication and Digital Studies major)
Enrollment	Approx. 15
Faculty instructor	Anand Rao
Faculty contact	arao@umw.edu

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

Seminar in Digital Rhetoric is the capstone upper-level seminar for Communication and Digital Studies majors where students grapple with the ways that the art of rhetoric has been challenged throughout history with the development and use of new communication technologies, with a focus on contemporary digital communication tools. The course follows a typical seminar format with class discussion of primary texts.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

For this activity, I am introducing the use of short debates to introduce topics for the week that speak to both public advocacy and digital culture. The short debate, held between two speakers, will last approximately fifteen minutes. The debates will be held at the beginning of the week and the students who participate will then lead discussion for that class period. I will also include a debate response paper assignment, in which students will write a 1-2 page response after each of the debates.

The activities will be included at the start of most weeks as new topics are introduced to the class. There will be at least eight debates, providing each student with the opportunity to debate once. The response papers will be assigned after each of the debates to prepare for ongoing class discussion on the topic. Use of these activities throughout the semester will also provide the opportunity for discussion about student performance and development in the activities as the semester progresses. The goal is to not only provide opportunities for individual student participation, but to also use the debates and response papers to prompt ongoing discussion and analysis of advocacy, deliberation, and civic learning within the context of a digital culture.

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

I drew upon two learning outcomes that we have for the major program that are particularly well-suited for these activities. The first, to analyze, critique, and respond to issues in contemporary digital culture, will be met with student performance on the debate. Their ability to engage and respond to one another will demonstrate their ability to analyze, critique, and respond. The second, to advocate a course of action to address local, national and/or global issues from a communication perspective, will be met through student performance on the debate, as it will assess their ability to advocate for a specific course of action to address the issues identified in the debate resolution. The second learning outcome will also be met through the debate response papers, as students will outline how to evaluate the debate. The response papers will also be used to prepare students for class discussion about how to prepare discussion of the debate topic for a general audience.

Short Debate Assignment

Each student will participate in one short debate early in the session.

- Affirmative constructive: 4 minutes
- Negative cross-examination of affirmative: 1 minute
- Negative constructive: 4 minutes
- Affirmative cross-examination of negative: 1 minute
- Affirmative rebuttal: 2 minute
- Negative rebuttal: 2 minute

Your resolution will be tied to the topic assigned for that week in class. Select a resolution with enough material to discuss from both perspectives. It is expected that you will work together in finding materials and planning the debate- you should not, however, script the full debate. The affirmative will argue in favor of taking a specific action (on an appropriate level- individual/local/national action), and the negative will counter by either arguing that we do not take that action, or arguing that we take a different action, in its place. The opening speech should spell out the problem, what should be done, and some reasons for why this would be advantageous. The rebuttal should be used to respond to the other side's arguments, and to explain how the audience should evaluate the debate (what they should do, and why, given all that has been said). Use the cross-examination to clarify points, set-up your own arguments, and point out flaws in what was proposed.

Students are expected to work together to prepare. Contact the instructor with your resolution once it is selected. You will decide which of you will be on the affirmative and which on the negative.

Evaluation Sheet for Short Debate

Affirmative constructive: 4 minutes
Negative cross-examination of affirmative: 1 minute
Negative constructive: 4 minutes
Affirmative cross-examination of negative: 1 minute
Affirmative rebuttal: 2 minute
Negative rebuttal: 2 minute

NAME:

TOPIC:

Rate the speaker on each point: E-excellent G-good A-average F-fair P-poor

TOPIC

Fit the time limits
Topic handled imaginatively and creatively
Clear action advocated

PURPOSE

Clear sense of purpose
Actually informed audience of something

INTRODUCTION

Gained attention and interest
Introduced topic/purpose clearly

RESEARCH

Adequate and sufficient research

BODY

Organization well planned
Transitions used to connect ideas
Vivid ending
Developed a cogent argument
Rebuttal was on point and advanced the debate

DELIVERY

Extemporaneously delivery
Unobtrusive use of notes
Sustained eye contact with the audience
Volume appropriate for the room

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	Roman Civilization
Discipline	Classics
Course level	Lower division
Enrollment	35
Faculty instructor	Joseph Romero
Faculty contact	jromero@umw.edu

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

Ancient Rome, and Greece, for that matter, are of interest in part because they are the two exemplars of democratic government before the revolutions in the U.S. and France. Democracy and democratic processes feature heavily in any introduction to Roman Civilization. That Rome is also a place where democracy was retained only in name while being transformed in substance into authoritarian rule. Advocacy, deliberation, and civic learning are practices that make most sense in places where certain freedoms are valued and protected.

Roman Civilization (CLAS 105) is an excellent place to build these skills and virtues. Students examine the life cycle of democratic freedoms from birth to death in ancient Rome and cannot help but compare them to the condition of those freedoms in their own contexts.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

Project: The Fate of Democracy (aka The Republic)

Rome, so the story goes, was founded as a monarchy in 753 BCE, but since 509 BCE had proudly championed itself as the outstanding example of true democracy in the ancient Mediterranean. (The Latin word for democracy, incidentally, is *res publica*, "Republic.") In 30 BCE, however, Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus (the future Augustus, first emperor of Rome) found himself the leader of a massively deteriorated political institution, the last man standing after a bloody and unprincipled fight to the death against Mark Antony, concluding a century of civil unrest. Between 30 BCE and his death in 14 CE, Augustus undid the democracy and transformed it back into a monarchy. After Augustus, there are no more elections. And yet Rome survived and prospered in various forms (the Western half survives till 476 CE, the Eastern half till 1453 CE).

This account looks as though some superior, all-powerful individual made it happen all by himself. But Augustus had to work on Roman society as he found it. Roman society is composed of multiple elements that are fundamentally transformed in their values, hopes, ambitions, expectations: the patricians (ruling class), equestrians (i.e., the business and bureaucratic class), plebs (working class), soldiers (military class).

In this exercise you will be divided into these four groups. This term you will read various primary and secondary sources to understand the perspectives of your group vis-à-vis the other three groups. Augustus needed all or enough of these groups to accept the proposition that

political freedom was not, in the final analysis, worth preserving. What must it have been like to participate in the destruction of a democracy?

Ground rules:

(a) Assume your group has a relatively coherent set of interests.

(b) All claims must be grounded in a primary sources.

A rubric based on debate performance and civic engagement will be used to evaluate success.

1. Patricians: Equestrians
2. Patricians: Plebs
3. Patricians: Soldiers
4. Equestrians: Plebs
5. Equestrians: Soldiers
6. Plebs: Soldiers

Resources

(Excerpts from the following)

Primary:

Cicero Republic, Selected Speeches

Livy History of Rome

Sallust Bellum Catalinae

Suetonius Life of Augustus

Tacitus Histories, Annals, Agricola, Dialogue on Orators

Velleius Paterculus Roman History

Secondary:

Ronald Syme The Roman Revolution

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

Learning Objectives:

- Knowledge (knowledge of how a state can be organized, what institutions define states and if/how the form of government changes them, what power and roles a citizen can hope to wield, etc.)
- Skills (dialogue, interpersonal perspective taking, critical systematic thought)
- Values (respect for freedom and dignity, empathy, open-mindedness, tolerance, justice, promoting equality, integrity, and the common good)
- Behaviors (from dialogue between individuals around difference)

Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning
Course Overview

The Basics

Course name	Planning History and Practice
Discipline	Historic Preservation
Course level	200
Enrollment	Approx. 50 per year, in two sections
Faculty instructor	Andréa Livi Smith
Faculty contact	alsmith@umw.edu

Description of the course to incorporate your *Advocacy, Deliberation, and Civic Learning* activity.

The purpose of this course is to introduce students to the theories, methods and practical applications involved in the field of planning, particularly at the state and local levels. The first section of the course is devoted to a study of the history of planning in the United States. This provides the proper context for the remainder of the course. The second section emphasizes modern planning concepts, tools and procedures, both in terms of theory and practice. The third section of the course focuses on various sub-disciplines of urban planning, in particular those relating to historic preservation. These include urban design, sustainability, transportation, etc.

Description of the activity or approach to be woven into the course.

The Visioning Exercise is the first major assignment in HISP 209: Planning History and Practice. It is an in-class, team-based exercise that teaches students the importance of the rational comprehensive planning (RCP) process.

When taught in person, the visioning exercise takes up two class periods. The first one is dedicated to playing the team based exercise, or game, twice: first with three tasks given in sequential order, second with the tasks given together. The second class period is dedicated to debriefing what has been learned from the game and discussing additions that could make the game more realistic.

When taught in person, the visioning exercise includes the use of custom LEGO base maps, LEGO pieces that are placed upon the map, as well as detailed instruction sheets. These are copied below.

Each city, consisting of five neighborhoods, are given the task of placing three crucial amenities - transportation, housing, and parks - in a different order. They must negotiate within the group before placing the items. At the end of each game, the total city points and

neighborhood points are tallied, based on the benefits of the amenities at the neighborhood level and at the city level.

Describe the learning outcomes related to advocacy, deliberation & civic learning that will be accomplished in part through this new activity/approach. How will you know if students are accomplishing these outcomes?

The rational comprehensive planning process is at the heart of urban planning practice in America. Therefore, this exercise aims to emphasize the major components of the RCP.

Namely:

- The difficulty of planning for disparate aspects of the built environment without taking the entire context into consideration.
- The often intractable conflict between citywide needs and neighborhood needs.
- The need to balance consensus building and the development of a coherent vision.
- The unavoidable “losing end” of the planning process.
- The crucial importance of public participation.

The challenging part of this assignment is allowing for the messiness, the chaotic debate of the planning process, but also coming to clear decisions. The debrief period of the activity is therefore crucial to make sure students garner conclusions. Debrief includes first each team presenting their resulting city to the class. Once all the teams have presented, they are asked whether anything would improve the process. They eventually mention planning for all the changes simultaneously. At this point, they go back to their respective teams and re-design the city with the three goals at once, and present their decisions to the class once again. This allows them to understand that the RCP process does not resolve injustice or tradeoffs but does allow for much more informed and therefore effective decision-making. I am trying to develop a non-graphical version of the assignment to be taught remotely.