THE CENTER FOR JUSTICE & PEACEBUILDING A PROGRAM OF EASTERN MENNONITE UNIVERSITY	**RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PRACTICES** **PAX 676** Spring 2021 *Wednesdays, 8:45-11:45 a.m. ET* *Hartzler Library CJP JAMAR Classroom/LB 121 & via Zoom*

INSTRUCTOR'S INFORMATION:

Carl Stauffer, PhD., Associate Professor of Justice Studies & Peacebuilding
E-mail: carl.stauffer@emu.edu
Office Tel: 540-432-4462
Office Hours: Mondays & Thursdays – by appointment only
Online Office Location : https://zoom.us/j/5404324462

Tammy Krause took over teaching class February 19, 2021 for the remainder of the semester.

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Restorative Justice originated as a practice-based discipline. However, the field has experienced exponential growth in the theory and research of RJ in the last decade. The course will be framed by four essential values of RJ: encounter, amends, reintegration and inclusion. The content of the course will be embedded in the key practice models that drive the Restorative Justice field – VOC/VOD, FGC, and Circle Processes. The class will also explore structural applications of RJ practice in the workplace, schools, prisons, dealing with historical harms, and in transitional justice processes globally. Conducted in a seminar format, students will have ample lab time to exercise the skills, complete assignments that are directly related to in-field competencies (e.g. policy reviews, writing program concept and funding documents, facilitating training sessions and engaging in self and peer assessments), as well as grapple with the theory and ethics that drive RJ practice. For MA in Conflict Transformation students this satisfies the skills assessment course requirement if taken for 3 credits, and is a required course for all students enrolled in the MA and Certificate in Restorative Justice programs.

COURSE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

- Deepen knowledge of the history, theory and values frameworks that drive RJ practices
- Build skill-sets for foundational RJ practices
- Increase competencies in practical applications of RJ around issues of policy, program development, writing funding documents, training/facilitation, and self, peer and program evaluation processes
- Develop understanding of new applications of RJ approaches across all sectors and levels of society

REQUIRED TEXTS AND OTHER RESOURCES:

Main Texts:

1. Lewis, T. & Stauffer, C. (eds.) (2021). *Listening to the Movement: Essays on New Growth and New Challenges in Restorative Justice.* Eugene, OR: Cascade Books. Online at: https://zehr-institute.org/publications/listening-to-the-movement/

2. Umbreit, M., and Armour, M. (2011). *Restorative Justice Dialogue: An Essential Guide for Research and Practice*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company. ISBN: 978-082612258-2. $ 49.88.

3. Van Ness, D. and Strong, K. (2014). *Restoring Justice: An Introduction to Restorative Justice*. Routledge Publishing. ISBN: 978-1455731398. $42.70

4. Walker, L., and Greening, R. (2011). *Reentry and Transition Planning Circles for Incarcerated People*. Hawai'I Friends of Justice and Civic Education. ISBN: 978-0615529424. $36.00

Little Book Series: (6 books at $5 ea.= $30) – *If you do not already have copies of these, all these books can be purchased in the CJP main office at the front desk. There are also copies of all these books in the Library.*

- The Little Book of Victim-Offender Conferencing
- The Little Book of Family Group Conferencing
- The Little Book of Circle Processes
- The Little Book of Restorative Discipline for Schools
- The Little Book of RJ for People in Prison
- The Little Book of RJ for Colleges & Universities

Note: Other training manuals may be part of the required reading for the course. These manuals will be uploaded on Moodle as PDF files.

Supplemental Text:

Gavrielides, T. (2007) *"Restorative Justice Theory and Practice: Addressing the Discrepancy"*, European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control: Helsinki, Finland **(PDF will be provided for free on Moodle).**

REQUIRED ASSIGNMENTS:

3 CREDIT HOURS – TOTAL: 100 POINTS

Participation – (25 points)

As this is a practice course your active participation is taken very seriously. By participation we mean not only attendance and participating in class discussions – it also includes your practices of self and peer assessment, written submissions to the class discussion forums online and facilitation of RJ cases on EMU campus and/or mini-training sessions.

Basic Professional Writing Assignments – (25 points) - Choose one of the 3 options below:

- ***RJ Project Narrative Concept Paper*** – (5-7 pages) You will formulate an RJ project proposal narrative including sections on Background motivation & current need (also called problem statement), vision, mission/aim, goals & objectives, proposed activities, beneficiaries, timeframes, risks and indicators of success (plans on how to measure / evaluate project impact).
- ***RJ Project Funding Concept Paper*** – (5-7 pages) Present a executive summary of a proposed RJ project and then outline a detailed budget for the proposal including explanatory notes and motivations for the budget figures.
- ***RJ Professional Practice Reflection Paper -*** (5-7 pages) Class participants can choose to write a reflective paper on their experiences in facilitating RJ cases with students on the EMU campus. ***(More information will be provided in class).***

Advanced Professional Writing Assignments – (50 points) - Choose one of the 3 options below:

- ***RJ Policy / Legislative Policy Analysis Paper*** – (10-15 pages) – Choose an actual piece of RJ policy or legislation and analyze it according to the frameworks, ethics, analysis models or tools introduced in the course. Including critiques of the current policy and suggested improvements.
- ***RJ Organizational / Community Intervention Proposal*** – (10-15 pages) – Choose a real-time case or current news event of injustice that you are familiar with, analyze the root issues using an RJ lens and propose a detailed intervention response including how to identify and engage the critical stakeholders involved, direct and indirect actions you would take and motivate why, what your expected outcome would be and how you would propose making the intervention sustainable.
- ***RJ Case Study*** – (10-15 pages) – Develop and write an in-depth case study of a historic or current RJ intervention that you are familiar with or have strong second-hand knowledge of that has not been documented to date. It does not matter whether is has had a successful or failed outcome, the most important point is what can be learned from the case. You will write the case study to be used for educational purposes including reflection questions for the reader to better engage and understand the case study.

2 CREDIT HOURS – TOTAL: 70 POINTS

Participation – (20 points)

As this is a practice course your active participation is taken very seriously. By participation we mean not only attendance and participating in class discussions – it also includes your practices of self and peer assessment, written submissions to the class discussion forums online and facilitation of RJ cases on EMU campus and/or mini-training sessions.

Advanced Professional Writing Assignments – (50 points) - Choose one of the 3 options below:

- ***RJ Policy / Legislative Policy Analysis Paper*** – (10-15 pages) – Choose an actual piece of RJ policy or legislation and analyze it according to the frameworks, ethics, analysis models or tools introduced in the course. Including critiques of the current policy and suggested improvements.
- ***RJ Organizational / Community Intervention Proposal*** – (10-15 pages) – Choose a real-time case or current news event of injustice that you are familiar with, analyze the root issues using an RJ lens and propose a detailed intervention response including how to identify and engage the critical stakeholders involved, direct and indirect actions you would take and motivate why, what your expected outcome would be and how you would propose making the intervention sustainable.
- ***RJ Case Study*** – (10-15 pages) – Develop and write an in-depth case study of a historic or current RJ intervention that you are familiar with or have strong second-hand knowledge of that has not been documented to date. It does not matter whether is has had a successful or failed outcome, the most important point is what can be learned from the case. You will write the case study to be used for educational purposes including reflection questions for the reader to better engage and understand the case study.

These are brief descriptions of required graded assignments for the course. More details for each assignment can be found on the "Guidance Notes" that will be provided on Moodle.

Non-Credit/Professional Development

If you are taking this course for professional development, and not for academic credit, you will be expected to attend class and fully engage in the readings, class discussion, and in-class exercises (e.g. case studies, role-plays & simulations). No written assignments are required. However, you are welcome to participate in any online discussion forums and/or any of the assignments that you feel would supplement your learning experience. This is up to your discretion.

SCHEDULE AND TOPICS:

Session Date:	Topics:	Required Reading:
Jan. 20	**Introduction:** • Building the learning community • Facilitating embodied pedagogy • Action-Reflection Cycle of Learning • Practice Storyboarding Exercise • MCC RJ Video	Van Ness & Strong – Ch. 1 Umbreit & Armour – Ch. 1 *Listening to the Mov't* – (Forward, Intro Chapters) **Supplemental Reading:** Gavrielides - (pp. 1-36) **[On Moodle]** Kolb – Experiential Learning
Jan. 27	**Mapping RJ Practices: History & Myths of RJ** • Discussion: Reading & Forum Q&A • Inputs: History of RJ • Skills: Deepening Listening & Communication – (rephrasing, paraphrasing, summary & laundering language)	Van Ness & Strong – Ch. 2-3 Umbreit & Armour – Ch. 4 *Listening to the Mov't* – Ch. 1 **[On Moodle]** Stauffer, *Formative Myths in Mennonite Peacebuilding & Restorative Justice* **[On Moodle]** *Various readings on the History of RJ*
Feb 3	**Practice Training Session # 1: VOM** • Model: Victim-Offender Mediation (VOM) • Practice: Severe Violence VOM Guided Case Study • Role-play / Simulations	Umbreit & Armour – Ch. 5 **[On Moodle]** Zehr & Stutzman-Amstutz, *VORP Manual* **[On Moodle]** Supplemental articles on VOM Research
Feb 10	**Practice Training Session # 2: VOC / VOD** • Model: Victim-Offender Conferencing (VOC) or Dialogue (VOD) • Practice: C4RJ Video & Conferencing Script (O'Donnell) • Role-play / Simulations	Stutzman-Amstutz, *Little Book of Victim-Offender Conferencing* **[On Moodle]** Brookes & McDonough – *The Difference between Mediation and Restorative Justice/Practice* **[On Moodle]** Supplemental article on VOD Research

Feb 17	**Mapping RJ Practices: Theories of RJ** • Discussion: Reading & Forum Q&A • Inputs: Theories behind RJ Practices • Skills: (Inquiry, decision-making, brainstorming & consensus processes) • Guest Practitioner – Lauren Abramson – (Baltimore) - **TBA**	Van Ness & Strong – Ch. 4-5 **Supplemental Reading:** Gavrielides – (pp. 36-52) **[On Moodle]** *Wheeldon article on Theory of RJ* **[On Moodle]** *Gilbert & Settles article on Community RJ Theory*
Feb 24	**Practice Training Session # 3: FGC** • Model: Family Group Conferencing (FGC) • Practice: Stephen's Whanu • Role-play / Simulations	McCrae & Zehr, *Little Book of Family Group Conferencing* Umbreit & Armour – Ch. 6
Mar 3	**Mapping RJ Practices: Ethics & Values of RJ** • Discussion: Reading & Forum Q&A • Inputs: Values/Ethics driving RJ Practice • Skills: (NVC – Nonviolent Communication) • Guest Practitioner – Sarah King – (Minnesota) - **TBA**	Van Ness & Strong – Ch. 6-7 Umbreit & Armour – Ch. 2-3 *Listening to the Mov't* – Ch. 7 & Epilogue **Supplemental Reading:** Gavrielides – (pp. 52-79, & pp. 234- 264) **[On Moodle]** Sharpe – *Walk the Talk Manual*
Mar 10	**Practice Training Session # 4: Circle Process** • Model: Circles Processes • Practice: CIRCLES software • Role-play / Simulations	Pranis, *Little Book of Circle Processes* Umbreit & Armour – Ch. 7 **Supplemental:** Pranis – *Circle Manuals* (2X) **[On Moodle]** Fellegi & Szego – *Handbook for Facilitating Peacemaking Circles* **[On Moodle]** *Stuart – Canadian Peacemaking Circles Manual* **[On Moodle]** *Supplemental articles on Circle processes*

Mar 17	**Mapping RJ Practices: RJ Analysis Tools** • Discussion: Reading & Forum Q&A • Inputs: RJ Analysis Instruments & Tools • Skills: Applying RJ analysis tools • Guest Practitioner – Dana Coles – (Key Bridge) - **TBA**	Van Ness & Strong – Ch. 8 **Supplemental Reading:** Gavrielides - (pp. 81-131) • **Mid-term Assignment Due: Wednesday, March 17 at 12 midnight -** Basic Professional Writing
Mar 24	**Practice Training Session # 5:** • Models: RJ Applications in Schools & organizations • RJOY Videos • Case study / Role-play / Simulation • Guest facilitator – Dr. Kathy Evans – (EMU) - **TBA**	Amstutuz-Stutzman & Mullet, *Little Book of Restorative Discipline for Schools* *Listening to the Mov't – Ch. 4-6* **[On Moodle]** Henderson – *School-based RJ as an Alternative to Zero-Tolerance Policies* **[On Moodle]** Yusem, McClung, Sarikey, & Wilson – *Oakland RJ Schools Program Report*
Mar 31	**Mapping RJ Practices: RJ Policy & Legislation** • Discussion: Reading & Forum Q&A • Inputs: RJ Policy & Legislation • Skills: Applying Policy analysis & briefing • Guest Practitioner – Thalia Gonzales or Senator Pete Lee (CO) - **TBA**	Van Ness & Strong – Ch. 9 *Listening to the Mov't* – Ch. 8 **Supplemental Reading:** Gavrielides, (pp. 133-155) **[On Moodle]** *The Balanced and RJ Model – OJJDP* **[On Moodle]** *The Politics of Atonement* **[On Moodle]** *Various Policy Documents uploaded on Moodle*
Apr 7	**Practice Training Session # 6: CJ, TJ & Community RJ processes** • Models: Community & Systems RJ / TJ Interventions • Practice: Prison Re-entry Circles and COSA • Case study / Role-play / Simulations	Walker & Greening - *Reentry Manual for Incarcerated People* Umbreit & Armour – Ch. 8-9 Toews, *Little Book of Restorative Justice for People in Prison*

		[On Moodle] brown – *Emergent Strategy* – (pp. 43-50 & pp. 213-270) **[On Moodle]** Chen et al – *The Revolution starts at home* – Ch. Beautiful, Difficult, Powerful (The Chrysalis Collective)
Apr 14	**Mapping RJ Practices: Historical Harms** • Discussion: Reading & Forum Q&A • Inputs: Dealing with Historical harms & Transitional Justice processes restoratively • Skills: Applying THH processes & Guided case study on memorialization in the US slavery history • Local RJ Practitioner Panel – **TBA**	Van Ness & Strong – Ch. 10 **Supplemental Reading:** Gavrielides, (pp.157-232) **[On Moodle]** Hooker & Cjazkowski – *Transforming Historical Harms Manual (THH)*
Apr 21	**Practice Training Session # 7 (Part 1):** • Models: THH, DDR & Indigenous Justice approaches • Practice: SA TRC • Case study / role-play / simulations	Umbreit & Armour – Ch. 10-11 *Listening to the Mov't* – Ch. 2-3 **[On Moodle]** *Campbell article on Richmond – Capital City of Slavery*
Apr 28	**Practice Training Session # 8 (Part 2):** • Models: THH, DDR & Indigenous Justice approaches • Practice: DDR and post-war ex-combatant reintegration • Case study / role-play / simulations • Closing Circle	*Listening to the Mov't* – Ch. 9 **[On Moodle]** Stauffer – *Ex-Combatant Reintegration Manual* • **Final Assignment Due: Wednesday, April 28 at 12 midnight –** *Advanced Professional Writing Assignment*
May 5	TBA	

****APRIL 16-25 IS THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAM FOR THOSE STUDENTS TAKING FOUNDATIONS 2****
APRIL 19-24 IS THE ACE FESTIVAL WEEK AT EMU

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR COURSE SYLLABI: Last reviewed December 2020

Writing Guidelines:
Writing will be a factor in evaluation: EMU has adopted a set of writing guidelines for graduate programs that include six sets of criteria: content, structure, rhetoric & style, information literacy, source integrity, and conventions (see page 3). It is expected that graduates will be able to write at least a "good" level with 60% writing at an "excellent" level. For the course papers, please follow the APA style described in CJP's *GUIDELINES for GRADUATE PAPERS* (see CJP Student Resources Moodle page or request a copy from the Academic Program Coordinator), unless directed otherwise by the instructor.

Academic Integrity Policy (AIP):
EMU faculty and staff care about the integrity of their own work and the work of their students. They create assignments that promote interpretative thinking and work intentionally with students during the learning process. Honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility are characteristics of a community that is active in loving mercy and doing justice. EMU defines plagiarism as occurring when a person presents as one's own someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source (Adapted from the Council of Writing Program Administrators). This course will apply EMU's AIP to any events of academic dishonesty. If you have doubts about what is appropriate, Indiana University's Plagiarism Tutorials and Tests may be a useful resource.

Turnitin:
Students are accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. Thus, you should be familiar with EMU's Academic Integrity Policy (see above) in order to meet the academic expectations concerning appropriate documentation of sources. In addition, EMU is using Turnitin, a learning tool and plagiarism prevention system. For CJP classes, you may be asked to submit your papers to Turnitin from Moodle.

Moodle:
Moodle is the online learning platform that EMU has chosen to provide to faculty, administrators and students. Students will have access to course information within Moodle for any class they are registered for in a given term. The amount of time a student has access to information before and after the class is somewhat dependent on the access given to students by the individual faculty member. However, please note that courses are not in Moodle permanently – after three years the class will no longer be accessible. Please be sure to download resources from Moodle that you wish to have ongoing access to.

Technology Requirements and Communication/Zoom Best Practices:
Communication will largely be accomplished via the Moodle platform utilized by EMU and your EMU email. Check both frequently during the semester. Zoom will be used for synchronous online course sessions. Please review these best practices for online classes!

Graduate & Professional Studies Writing Center:
Please utilize the writing program! They offer free individual sessions with a graduate student writing consultant. Please visit the website to schedule an appointment or request additional information from CJP's Academic Program Coordinator.

Institutional Review Board (IRB):
All research conducted by or on EMU faculty, staff or students must be reviewed by the Institutional Review Board to assure participant safety.

Grading Scale & Feedback:
In most courses *grades* will be based on an accumulation of numerical points that will be converted to a letter grade at the end of the course (several CJP courses are graded pass/fail). Assignments will receive a score expressed as a fraction, with the points received over the total points possible (e.g. 18/20). The following is the basic scale used for evaluation. *Points may be subtracted for missed deadlines.*

95-100 = A outstanding	90-94 = A- excellent	85-89 = B+ very good
80-84 = B good	76-79 = B- satisfactory	73-75 = C+ passing
70-72 = C unsatisfactory	Below 70 = F failing	

Graduate students are expected to earn A's & B's. A GPA of 3.0 for MA students and 2.75 for GC students is the minimum requirement for graduation.

Regarding feedback on papers/projects: Students can expect to receive papers/assignments back in a class with faculty feedback before the next paper/assignment is due. This commitment from faculty assumes that the student has turned the paper in on the agreed upon due date.

Library
The Hartzler Library offers research support (via e-mail, chat, phone, or SSC campus) and the library home page offers subject guides to help start your research.

Office of Academic Access:
If you have a physical, psychological, medical or learning disability that may impact your work in this course, it is your responsibility to contact the Office of Academic Access. They will work with you to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. All information and documentation is treated confidentially.

Class Attendance (for in-person and synchronous online courses):
Students are expected to attend all class meetings. If unusual or emergency circumstances prevent class attendance, the student should notify the professor in advance if possible. Multiple absences from class will result in lower grades. The student is responsible for the material presented in classes missed (from EMU Graduate Catalog). Students should be aware of the importance of regular class attendance, particularly in the case of CJP classes that only meet once a week or over several weekends. Being absent for more than one class leads to a student missing a large portion of the class content. In addition to consistent class attendance, students should make every effort to arrive to class on time out of respect for the learning process, fellow students and faculty.

Course Extensions and Outstanding Grades:
For fall and spring semesters, all coursework is due by the end of the semester. If a student will not be able to complete a course on time, the student must submit a request one week before the end of the semester for an extension (up to 6 months), by emailing the instructor, academic advisor and the Academic Program Coordinator. If the request is granted the student will receive an "I (incomplete) for the course which will later be replaced by a final grade when the work has been turned in on the agreed upon date. If the request for an extension is denied, the student will receive a grade for the work that has been completed up until the time the course was expected to have been completed. If no work has been submitted, the final grade will be an F (or W under unusual circumstances and with permission of the Program Director). Extensions will be given only for legitimate and unusual situations. Extensions are contracted by the student with the program for up to a maximum of 6 months after the deadline for the course work. *PLEASE NOTE: Grades for coursework submitted late may be reduced at the instructor's discretion and in line with their course policy on turning in coursework after the due date. If the extension deadline is not met, the instructor will submit the final grade based on what has been received to date.*

Inclusive, Community-Creating Language Policy:
Eastern Mennonite University expects all its faculty, staff, and students to adopt inclusive written and spoken language that welcomes everyone regardless of race or ethnicity, gender, disabilities, age, and sexual orientation. We will use respectful and welcoming language in all our official departmental documents and correspondence, including those put forth by way of Internet communication, and throughout all academic coursework, inclusive of classroom presentations and conversations, course syllabi, and both written and oral student assessment materials (see CJP Student Resources moodle page or request a complete copy along with best practices from the Academic Program Coordinator).

Title IX:
The following policy applies to any incidents that occur (on or off campus or online) while you are a student registered at EMU. It does not apply if you are talking about incidents that happened prior your enrollment at EMU. It is important for you to know that all faculty and staff members are required to report known or alleged incidents of sexual violence (including sexual assault, domestic/relationship violence, stalking). That means that faculty and staff members cannot keep information about sexual violence confidential if you share that information with them. For example, if you inform a faculty or staff member of an issue of sexual harassment, sexual assault, or discrimination they will keep the information as private as they can, but is required to bring it to the attention of the institution's Title IX Coordinator. You can also report incidents or complaints through the online portal. You may report, confidentially, incidents of sexual violence if you speak to Counseling Services counselors, Campus Ministries' pastors, or Health Services personnel providing clinical care. These individuals, as well as the Title IX Coordinator, can provide you with information on both internal & external support resources. Please refer to the Student Handbook for additional policies, information, and resources available to you.

Academic Program Policies:
For EMU graduate program policies and more CJP-specific graduate program policies, please see the complete graduate catalog.

Writing Standards –Graduate Level *(revised Spring 2016)*

Criteria	A *excellent*	B *adequate expectations*	C *below expectations*	Comments
Content *(quality of the information, ideas and supporting details)*	• shows clarity of purpose • offers depth of content • applies insight and represents original thinking • follows guidelines for content	• shows some clarity of purpose • offers some depth of content • applies some insight and some original thinking • mostly follows guidelines for content	• shows minimal clarity of purpose • offers minimal depth of content or incorrect content • applies minimal insight and original thinking • does not follow guidelines for content	
Structure *(logical order or sequence of the writing)*	• shows coherence, and logically developed paragraphs • uses very effective transitions between ideas and sections • constructs appropriate introduction and conclusion	• shows some coherence and some logically developed paragraphs • uses some effective transitions between ideas & sections • shows some construction of appropriate introduction and conclusion	• shows minimal coherence and logically developed paragraphs • uses minimal transitions between ideas and sections • shows minimal construction of appropriate introduction and conclusion	
Rhetoric and Style *(appropriate attention to audience)*	• is concise, eloquent and rhetorically effective • effectively uses correct, varied and concise sentence structure • is engaging to read • writes appropriately for audience and purpose	• is somewhat concise, eloquent, and rhetorically effective • generally uses correct, varied, and concise sentence structure • is somewhat engaging to read • generally writes appropriately for audience and purpose	• shows minimal conciseness, eloquence, and rhetorical effectiveness • uses incorrect, monotonous or simplistic sentence structure • is not engaging to read • lacks appropriate writing for audience and purpose • uses inappropriate jargon and clichés	
Information Literacy *(locating, evaluating, and using effectively the needed information as appropriate to assignment)*	• uses academic and reliable sources • chooses sources from many types of resources • chooses timely resources for the topic • integrates references and quotations to support ideas fully	• uses mostly academic and reliable sources • chooses sources from a moderate variety of types of resources • chooses resources with mostly appropriate dates • integrates references and quotations to provide some support for ideas	• lacks academic and reliable sources • chooses sources from a few types of resources • chooses a few resources with inappropriate dates • integrates references or quotations that are loosely linked to the ideas of the paper	
Source Integrity *(appropriate acknowledgment of sources used in research)*	• correctly cites sources for all quotations • cites paraphrases correctly and credibly • includes reference page • makes virtually no errors in documentation style • makes virtually no errors in formatting • incorporates feedback given in previous written assignments	• correctly cites sources for most quotations • usually cites paraphrases correctly and credibly • includes reference page with some errors • makes some errors in documentation style • makes some errors in formatting • incorporates some feedback given in previous written assignments	• provides minimal sources for quotations • sometimes cites paraphrases correctly and credibly, • includes reference page with many errors • makes many errors in documentation style • makes many errors in formatting • lacks incorporation of feedback given in previous written assignments	
Conventions *(adherence to grammar rules: usage, spelling & mechanics of Standard Edited English or SEE)*	• makes virtually no errors in SEE conventions • makes accurate word choices	• makes some errors SEE conventions • almost always makes accurate word choices	• makes many errors in SEE conventions • makes many inaccurate word choices	
The weighting of each of the six areas is dependent on the specific written assignment and the teacher's preference. Plagiarism occurs when one presents as one's own "someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source" (adapted from Council of Writing Program Administrators).				

Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects

CRITERIA	A – Excellent	B – Minimal expectations	C – Below expectations	Comments
Goals & Audience *Are the goals or learning objectives of the project clear? Have they been met?* *Is the intended audience clearly specified?* *Is the project appropriate for this audience?* *Does the project communicate to the intended audience?*	-audience & goals/learning objectives clearly identified. -project appropriate for, and likely to meet, its goals -project is appropriate for specified audience -project understandable to & likely to engage and/or communicate to audience	-audience and goals identified though not as clearly as they could be - project may meet its goals but this is not entirely clear - project is at least somewhat appropriate for, and likely to communicate to audience.	-audience and goals inappropriate or inadequately identified -project unlikely to meet its goals and/or communicate to the audience	
Methodology *Is the overall methodology clear and appropriately used?* *Has the project incorporated specific methods required by the assignment?* *If intended as a form of intervention, has thought be given to how it will be implemented?*	-project incorporates inquiry methods required by the assignment -all methodologies & technologies have been appropriately used, with attention to ethical and methodological issues -if intended as intervention or advocacy, project has given adequate thought to implementation -sources & methods are adequately identified	- methodology basically appropriate to the project and appropriately used, but could be strengthened -sources and methods identified but not as fully as they could be -more thought should be given to implementation issues	-methodology inadequate and/or inadequately articulated. -sources not appropriately identified -inadequate attention to implementation issues	
Analysis *Is there evidence of critical thinking and analysis?*	- evidence of critical thinking about methods, sources, information and analysis or editing. -uses analysis/editing methods appropriate for the project -method of analysis or editing is adequately articulated	- some evidence of critical thinking but could be stronger -analytical approach and the analysis itself is basically appropriate but could be stronger and/or articulated better.	-inadequate evidence of critical thinking -analysis lacking or inadequate -analytic approach inappropriate or inadequately specified	
Craft & Coherence *Is the level of artistic and/or technical craft adequate for the*	- level of craft is clearly adequate for the audience & to meet project goals (whether or not it meets "artistic" standards)	-level of craft is minimally adequate for the audience and goals -project coherence could be stronger	-level of craft inadequate for purposes and/or audience -project is not coherent	

specified goals and audience? *Did it involve an appropriate amount of work?* *Does the final product have coherence and "resonance?"*	-project is coherent & likely to resonate with the intended audience -product shows an appropriate amount of effort for this assignment			
Content *Is the content appropriate & adequate, given the goals, audience & assignment?* *Is there evidence of insight, originality &/or creativity?*	- information conveyed is clearly adequate for goals, audience & assignment -shows depth & breadth of content -shows insight, originality &/or creativity	-information conveyed is adequate but could be strengthened -some evidence of insight, originality, or creativity	-inadequate information -little or no evidence of insight, originality and/or creativity	
				Grade

Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects

Background notes:

• Arts approaches can be used in several different stages of a project:

1. To gain or create knowledge. (For example, research "subjects" or participants might be engaged in an arts-based project as a way of soliciting information or encouraging insight.)
2. To add complexity or nuance to created knowledge. (For example, an arts practice may serve as one method in a multi-method research project, creating an integrated, reflective methodology for the project. Alternatively, an arts practice could be used to analyze and/or interpret data collected by conventional methods.)
3. To test knowledge. (For example, researchers might verify their interpretation of findings from a more traditional research process by creating a play or exhibit and testing it for resonance with their subjects.)
4. To share findings. (For example, a play or exhibit might be created to (re)-present data collected or analyzed via conventional methods in order to impart the particular kinds of meaning the researcher considers important, and as a way to reach and engage a broader audience.)
5. As a form of intervention. (For example, a project might be designed to raise awareness of an issue or conflict, to promote dialogue on a contested issue, or to advocate for a cause.)

• Arts-based products often do not specify methodologies used. Thus it may be important for a project to be accompanied by a short paper discussing analysis, theory of change, audience, goals, and methods used.

• Patricia Leavy, *in "Method Meets Art: Arts-based Research Practice" (New York: Guilford Press) 2009, argues that "[t]raditional conceptions of validity and reliability, which developed out of positivism, are inappropriate for evaluating artistic inquiry." (p. 15).* She suggests that authenticity, trustworthiness, and validity can be assessed through attention to such elements as aesthetics, resonance, and vigor.

• For a discussion of standards, see "Method Meets Art" (Leavy, 2009: 15ff and Chapter 8).