

 <p>25 THE CENTER FOR JUSTICE & PEACEBUILDING</p>	<p>PAX 677: RESTORATIVE JUSTICE & WHOLE SYSTEMS APPROACHES</p> <p>Fall 2019</p> <p><i>Wednesdays, 8:45-11:45 a.m. Martin Store/MS 205 (CJP office building upstairs)</i></p>
---	---

INSTRUCTOR'S INFORMATION:

Carl Stauffer, PhD

Email: carl.stauffer@emu.edu

Tel: 540-432-4462

Office: Martin Store, Room 110

Office Hours: Tuesdays, 9 a.m. -12 p.m. & by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

The recent expansion of the Restorative Justice (RJ) field is almost breathtaking. We are now seeing an exponential volume of research, writing and practice exploding on the scene. This is exciting on one hand, daunting on another. There is general consensus that RJ as a field is at the edge of a totally new level of impact and influence. While controversial, many leaders in the field feel that RJ will either fade away, or be co-opted by the legal system as long as we view it as only one more "social service reform." However, if we understand it as a "social movement" and study and apply it as such it has a great potential for both serious interpersonal and structural transformation. This course is geared toward empowering RJ practitioners and thinkers who are prepared to position themselves (both internally and externally) as change agents for political, legal and social justice systems shifts. Through intensive reading, structured debates, tailor-made research on critical and emerging RJ issues, and interaction with leaders in the field, we will explore whole system applications of RJ in public violence contexts, in realigning societal institutions such as in schools, prisons, courts, and governance structures, and in post-war reconstruction efforts through hybrid transitional justice processes.

Each student is required to identify a particular "real-time" case scenario that they will use as their source material for developing a comprehensive whole systems RJ approach to structural change. The Emergent-Adaptive Systems model introduced and used in Foundations I & II, along with the work around Human Systems Dynamics (HSD) - www.hsdsinstitute.org/ will provide the primary frameworks for this course. Key terms and concepts that will be utilized to guide our thinking are:

- Chaos, disorganization & self-organizing theory
- Social capital networks and interdependencies (Network Weaving)
- Coalition building, social mobilization, and social movement theory & practice
- Systemic inputs & outputs, and
- Structural Information & Communication feedback loops.

© 2019, Carl Stauffer, PhD.

PAX 677 – RJ and Whole Systems Approaches

Fall 2019

The course is facilitated in a seminar format using circle process, reading summaries, presentations, group analysis & brainstorming (e.g. a think-tank model) and virtual interaction with various practice leaders in the fields of emergent-adaptive systems and restorative justice.

Note: This is one of several Seminar courses that are geared primarily to second year graduate students in the Center for Justice & Peacebuilding. These seminar courses will be capped at 15 students, with up to 18 students with special instructor permission. Students from other graduate programs should meet with the professor to determine the suitability of the course for their learning goals. In order to participate in this advanced seminar, students will be required to have completed either the Foundations I & II courses (offered by CJP) OR for MAED students either PAX 571 or PAX 676. This course satisfies a core requirement for MA in RJ students.

COURSE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

- Identify and dialogue on critical theory and practice within the Restorative Justice field
- Discover how restorative justice approaches might be applied at a whole systems level to effect and influence structural change
- Apply conceptual skills for mapping structural analysis, building collaborative movements, and guiding emergent systems change
- Improve professional skills in summarizing academic reading and key ideas of authors, critical thinking and dialogue with opposing views, and conduct public presentations of case studies and progressive intervention designs developed throughout the semester.

REQUIRED TEXTS AND OTHER RESOURCES:

1. Butcher, H., Banks, S., Henderson, P. & Robertson, J. (2007) (Eds.) *Critical Community Practice*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press, (184 pp.). \$31.46 – ISBN: 978-1-86134-791-6
2. Davis, F. (2019). *The Little Book of Race and RJ – Black Lives, Healing, and US Social Transformation*. New York, NY: Good Books, an imprint of Skyhorse Publishing, Inc. (112 pp.). \$ 5.95 – ISBN: 978-1-68099-343-1.
3. DeWolf, T., Geddes, J. (2019). *The little Book of Racial Healing – Coming to the Table for Truth-Telling, Liberation, and Transformation*. New York, NY: Good Books, an imprint of Skyhorse Publishing, Inc. (112 pp.). \$ 5.95 – ISBN: 978-1-68099-362-2.
4. Ginwright, S. (2016). *Hope and Healing in Urban Education*. London & New York: Routledge Publishers. (161 pp.) \$ 42.00 - ISBN: 978-1-138-79757-4.
5. Hooker, D. (2016). *The Little Book of Transformative Community Conferencing – A Hopeful, Practical Approach to Dialogue*. New York, NY: Good Books, an imprint of Skyhorse Publishing, Inc. (121 pp.). \$ 5.95 – ISBN: 978-68099-166-6.
6. Kahane, A. (2012). *Transformative Scenario Planning*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers. Inc. (126 pp.) \$17.95 – ISBN: 978-1-60994-490-2.
7. Woolford, A. (2009). *The Politics of Restorative Justice: A Critical Introduction*. Fernwood Publishers, (176 pp.). \$19.95 – ISBN: 978-1-5526-6316-5

Supplemental Reading Materials: Required reading selections from some sources on this list will be provided on Moodle:

- Acorn, A. (2004). *Compulsory Compassion – A Critique of Restorative Justice*. Vancouver, BC, Canada: University of British Columbia Press, (164 pp.)
- Bernstein, N. (2014). *Burning Down the House – The End of Juvenile Prison*. London, UK / New York, USA: The New Press, (320 pp.)
- Boyes-Watson, C. (2008). *Peacemaking Circles & Urban Youth – Bringing Justice Home*. St

- Paul, MN, USA: Living Justice Press, (230 pp.)
- Crampton, J. & Krygier, J. (2006). An Introduction to Critical Cartography. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 4 (1), 11-33.
 - DeValve, M. (2015). *A Different Justice – Love and the Future of Criminal Justice in America*. Durham, NC, USA: Carolina Academic Press, (200 pp.)
 - Galloway, B. & Hudson, J. (eds.) (1996). *Restorative Justice: International Perspectives*. Monsey, NY, USA: Kugler Publications & Criminal Justice Press, (532 pp.)
 - Gavrielides, T. (ed.) (2019). *Routledge International Handbook of Restorative Justice*. New York, NY: Routledge Press, an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, (504 pp.)
 - Greene, D. (2013). Repeat performance: is restorative justice another good reform gone bad? *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social, and Restorative Justice*, 16:3, 359-390.
 - Johnstone, G. (ed.) (2003). *A Restorative Justice Reader – Texts, sources, context*. London, UK / New York, USA: Routledge Press, (488 pp.)
 - London, R. (2006). Paradigms Lost: Repairing the Harm of Paradigm Discourse in Restorative Justice. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 19:4, 397-422.
 - London, R. (2011). *Crime, Punishment and Restorative Justice – A Framework for Restoring Trust*. Eugene, OR, USA: Wipe & Stock Publishers, (326 pp.)
 - Nocella II, A. (2011). An Overview of the History and Theory of Transformative Justice. *Peace & Conflict Review*, 6:1, 1-10.
 - Pavlich, G. (2005). *Governing Paradoxes of Restorative Justice*. New York, NY: Routledge-Cavendish & Glass House Press, (138 pp.)
 - Powell, J. (2012). *Racing to Justice – Transforming Our Conceptions of Self and Other to Build an Inclusive Society*. Bloomington, IN., USA: Indiana University Press, (246 pp.)
 - Pranis, K., Stuart, B., Wedge, M. (2003). *Peacemaking Circles – From Crime to Community*. St. Paul, MN, USA: Living Justice Press, (244 pp.)
 - Riestenberg, N. (2012). *Circle in the Square – Building Community and Repairing Harm in School*. St. Paul, MN, USA: Living Justice Press, (218 pp.)
 - Rihani, S. (2002). Implications of adopting a complexity framework for development. *Progress in Development Studies*, 2:2, 133-143.
 - Sullivan, D. & Tifft, L. (eds.) (2008). *Handbook of Restorative Justice*. London, UK / New York, USA: Routledge Press, (566 pp.)
 - Whitlock, K. & Bronski, M. (2015). *Considering Hate – Violence, Goodness, and Justice in American Culture and Politics*. Boston, MA, USA: Beacon Press, (142 pp.)
 - Woolford, A. & Ratner, R.S. (2008). *Informal Reckonings – Conflict Resolution in Mediation, Restorative Justice and Reparations*. Canada / New York, USA: Routledge-Cavendish, A Glasshouse Book, (132 pp.)
 - Zehr, H. & Toews, B. (eds.) (2010). *Critical Issues in Restorative Justice*. London, UK / Boulder, Co. USA: Lynne Rienner Publishers, (409 pp.)

REQUIRED ASSIGNMENTS:

Requirements for 3 academic credit hours – 100 points: (strongly suggested)

Participation – (10%): This is a focused seminar course. Without you, we wouldn't have a class. Come prepared to engage with colleagues, to participate in rigorous debate and dialogue on issues you care deeply about, and through presentations to share your own experiences and learn from others.

Presentations – (30%): Each student will be required to make weekly reading summary and response

presentations (3 minutes each), 3 major internal presentations (30 minutes each – 15-20 minutes of presentation & 10-15 minutes of Q&A) - one on each of the 3 phases of your case portfolio, and 1 final integrated presentation for the class and/or a Public Forum (with the option of inviting the EMU campus & external community).

Case Portfolio – (60%): 25 pages written OR Equivalent Arts-based Final Assignment

The components of the portfolio will be completed in 3 phases over the semester. They are meant to guide your learning and help you gather information for the final integrated product. You will have the opportunity to present on each phase of the case portfolio development and receive direct input in the form of group analysis and brainstorming around each phase of your case portfolio. This course design is meant to enhance your reflection and learning processes.

- **Phase 1: Mapping the Problem of Practice (PoP)** – In this first phase, you will make a case presentation and analysis of current disparities and disorganization of the elemental parts, actors and organizations that are keeping whole systems change from happening in your specific case. Of particular interest here is the identification of the current inputs & outputs that are inhibiting systemic change. You will use various structural analysis and systems mapping tools to develop this section and present to the group (including Sauer's RJ Analysis Tools found on Moodle if you so choose).
- **Phase 2: Nurturing Collaborative Practice** – In this middle phase, you will be concerned with how to create and build coalitions - coordinating the disparate elemental parts that make up the collective whole (identified in the first phase) in such a way as to encourage allied partner networks toward systems change. From the context of your case study, you will be exploring the social issues, policies/legislation, institutions and injustices that are calling for change. Of particular interest here is to uncover the information and communication feedback loops that are keeping the current injustices in place and how you would want to transform those feedback loops to construct more just systems. You will be asking yourself: What do I know? What do I want to learn about? How can I learn more? And who can help me learn more? And you will pursue answers to these questions in as many ways as possible.
- **Phase 3: Guiding Emergent-Adaptive Systems (EAS) change** – In this final phase, you will be essentially describing the desired emergent change you want to see. You will be identifying what relational, cultural and structural shifts you imagine will (or need to) occur in order for systemic change to be sustainable. This phase will feel speculative or prescriptive by necessity. In other words this is a hypothetical exercise anchored in real-world questions concerning systems change like:
 - What kind of system will emerge from your applied approaches?
 - What are the essential parts of the whole of the system that you see emerging?
 - What will be the necessary inputs and outputs for this system change to be durable?
 - What are the feedback loops that will be required in order to keep the emerging system as adaptive as possible?
 - How might you imagine measuring this system change & its adaptive qualities for the future?
 - What might be the unintended consequences resulting from this system change?

Requirements for 2 academic credit hours – 70 points:

Participation – (10%): This is a focused seminar course. Without you, we wouldn't have a class. Come prepared to engage with colleagues, to participate in rigorous debate and dialogue on issues you care deeply about, and through presentations to share your own experiences and learn from others.

Case Portfolio – (60%): 25 pages written OR Equivalent Arts-based Final Assignment

The components of the portfolio will be completed in 3 phases over the semester. They are meant to guide your learning and help you gather information for the final integrated product. You will have the opportunity to present on each phase of the case portfolio development and receive direct input in the form of group analysis and brainstorming around each phase of your case portfolio. This course design is meant to enhance your reflection and learning processes (**see above descriptions of each phase**).

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 in class.

SCHEDULE AND TOPICS:

Session Dates:	Content / topics Covered:	Readings & Assignments Due:
Session 1: Aug. 28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening Introductions, Expectations & Overview of syllabus Break to attend EMU Convocation – 9:45-10:45 am Presentation on Course Frameworks 	<p>Required: <i>Woolford, Ch. 1</i> <i>Pavlich, Ch. 1</i></p> <p>Supplemental: <i>Rihani Article on Complexity Frameworks</i> <i>Crampton & Krygier article on Critical Cartography (Moodle)</i></p>
Session 2: Sept. 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input: Understanding Phase 1 Reading presentations & discussions Mapping the Problem of Practice - Case Presentations Block # 1 (4 people) Group Analysis, Brainstorming & Input 	<p>Required: <i>Woolford, Ch. 2-3</i> <i>Davis, Ch. 1-2</i></p> <p>Supplemental: <i>Acorn, Ch. 1 & 6 (Moodle)</i></p>
Session 3: Sept. 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening Circle check-in Reading presentations & discussions Mapping the Problem of Practice - Case Presentations Block # 2 (4 people) Group Analysis, Brainstorming & Input 	<p>Required: <i>Woolford, Ch. 4-5</i> <i>Davis, Ch. 3-4</i></p> <p>Supplemental: <i>London Article on Paradigms Lost (Moodle)</i></p>
Session 4: Sept. 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading presentations & discussions Mapping the Problem of Practice - Case Presentations Block # 3 	<p>Required: <i>Woolford, Ch. 6-7</i> <i>Davis, Ch. 5-6</i></p>

	<p>(3 people) Group Analysis, Brainstorming & Input</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guest speaker: <i>Dr. Ram Baghat from Richmond Public Schools – Massive Resilience Program</i> Group Q & A 	<p>Supplemental: <i>Greene Article on Repeat Performance</i> <i>Dana Greene Webinar (ZI)</i> (Moodle)</p>
Session 5: Sept. 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening Circle check-in • Reading presentations & discussions • Guest Speaker: <i>Dr. Glenda Eoyang – Human Systems Dynamics (HSD)</i> Group Q & A 	<p>Required: <i>Woolford, Ch. 8</i> <i>Davis, Ch. 7</i></p> <p>Supplemental: <i>DeValve, Ch. 9 & 10 (Moodle)</i></p> <p>Due: Mapping Problem of Practice Assignment Completed</p>
Session 6: Oct. 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input: Understanding Phase 2 • Reading presentations & discussions • Nurturing Collaborative Practice – Presentations Block # 1 (4 people) Group Analysis, Brainstorming & Input 	<p>Required: <i>Butcher, et al, Ch. 1-3</i> <i>DeWolf & Geddes, Ch. 1-2</i></p> <p>Supplemental: <i>Boyes-Watson, Ch. 7 (Moodle)</i> <i>Riesterberg, Ch. 9 (Moodle)</i></p>
Session 7: Oct. 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading presentations & discussions • Nurturing Collaborative Practice – Presentations Block # 2 (4 people) Group Analysis, Brainstorming & Input • Mid-term Evaluation 	<p>Required: <i>Butcher et al, Ch. 4-6</i> <i>DeWolf & Geddes, Ch. 3-4</i></p> <p>Supplemental: <i>Zehr & Toews, Ch. 15 (Jantzi)</i> <i>Sullivan & Tiff, Ch. 34 (Gil)</i> (Moodle)</p>
Session 8: Oct. 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening Circle check-in • Reading presentations & discussions • Nurturing Collaborative Practice – Presentations Block # 3 (3 People) Group Analysis, Brainstorming & Input 	<p>Required: <i>Butcher et al, Ch. 7-9</i> <i>DeWolf & Geddes, Ch. 5-6</i></p> <p>Supplemental: <i>Zehr & Toews, Ch. 18 (Masters)</i> <i>Sullivan & Tiff, Ch. 36 (Dyck)</i> (Moodle)</p>
Session 9: Oct. 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening Circle check-in 	<p>Required: <i>DeWolf & Geddes, Ch. 7-9</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading presentations & discussions • Guest Speaker: <i>Frameworks for Building Collaboratives</i> – Boris Ozuna Group Q & A 	<i>Braswell, Fuller, Lozoff, Ch. 5&8</i> Supplemental: <i>Zehr & Toews, Ch. 17 (Boyes-Watson)</i> <i>Sullivan & Tifft, Ch. 38 (Harris) (Moodle)</i> Due: Nurturing Collaborative Practice Assignment Completed
Session 10: Oct 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input: Understanding Phase 3 • Reading presentations & discussions • Guiding Emergent-Adaptive Systems Change – Presentations Block # 1 (4 People) Group Analysis, Brainstorming & Input 	Required: <i>Kahane, Ch. 1-2</i> <i>Ginwright, Ch. 1-2</i> <i>Hooker, Ch. 1-2</i> Supplemental: <i>Gavrielides, Ch. 2 & 23</i>
Session 11: Nov 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening Circle check-in • Reading presentations & discussions • Guiding Emergent-Adaptive Systems Change – Presentations Block # 2 (4 People) Group Analysis, Brainstorming & Input 	Required: <i>Kahane, Ch. 3-4</i> <i>Ginwright, Ch. 3-4</i> <i>Hooker, Ch. 3-4</i> Supplemental: <i>Gavrielides, Ch. 4 & 7</i>
Session 12: Nov 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening Circle check-in • Reading presentations & discussions • Guiding Emergent-Adaptive Systems Change – Presentation Block # 3 (3 people) Group Analysis, Brainstorming & Input 	Required: <i>Kahane, Ch. 5-6</i> <i>Ginwright, Ch. 5-6</i> <i>Hooker, Ch. 5-6</i> Supplemental: <i>Gavrielides, Ch. 12 & 19</i>
Session 13: Nov 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening Circle check-in • Reading presentations & discussions • Guest Speaker: <i>Marinetta Cannito, Sicilian Mafia Case Study</i> Group Q & A 	Required: <i>Kahane, Ch. 7-9</i> <i>Ginwright, Ch. 7-8</i> <i>Hooker, Ch. 7-9</i> Supplemental: <i>Gavrielides, Ch. 26 & 29</i>

		Due: Guiding Systems Change Assignment Completed
November 27	NO CLASS – Thanksgiving Break	
Session 14: Dec 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Portfolio Seminar – Debrief & Learnings (Open-Space Technology) • Final Evaluation – (online) 	
Session 15: Dec 11	Final Portfolio Presentations	Integrated Portfolio – Final Assignment Completed Note: Final Assignment Due on <u>Friday, Dec 13-12 midnight</u>

CLASS FIELD TRIP INFORMATION: (THIS IS NOT MANDATORY)

<p><u>DATES:</u></p> <p>THURS. EVENING & FRI. ALL DAY: Nov 14-15</p> <p><u>NOTE:</u> THESE DATES ARE CONTINGENT UPON FAVOR OF THE PRISON ADMINISTRATION & US BEING ABLE TO GET SECURITY CLEARANCE.</p>	<p><u>TRIP TO SCI- PHOENIX PRISON IN GRATERFORD, PA – “LET’S CIRCLE UP” (LCU)</u></p> <p>LCU IS A RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PROGRAM RUN BY MEN INSIDE A MAXIMUM SECURITY FACILITY. THE TWO CO-LEADERS ARE CHARLES BOYD AND FELIX (PHILL) ROSADO.</p> <p>LCU LIKES TO PLAN THE TIME TOGETHER. THEY USUALLY FACILITATE A GOOD NUMBER OF EXERCISES THAT ALLOW US TO GET TO KNOW EACH OTHER. THEN, THEY TAKE US THROUGH THE TRAINING MATERIALS THAT THEY HAVE DEVELOPED AND USE INSIDE THE PRISON. AT THE END, THEY FIND IT HELPFUL TO GET OUR FEEDBACK ON THE TRAINING MATERIALS & FACILITATION EXPERIENCE AS THE PARTICIPANTS. WE USUALLY SHARE A BAGGED LUNCH WITH THE MEN INSIDE, BUT THIS MAY NOT BE POSSIBLE THIS YEAR.</p>	<p><u>TRIP LOGISTICS:</u></p> <p>WE WILL DRIVE UP THE NIGHT BEFORE (THURSDAY) RIGHT AFTER FOUNDATIONS 1 CLASS. IT’S A 4.5-5 HOUR DRIVE AND WE WILL PLAN TO CAR POOL. WE WILL STAY IN HOMES OF MEMBERS OF THE LOCAL MENNONITE CHURCH, <u>OR</u> IF YOU ARE NOT COMFORTABLE WITH THAT ARRANGEMENT YOU CAN BOOK A LOCAL HOTEL / MOTEL. WE WILL SPEND THE DAY WITH LCU FROM 8 AM TO 3:30 PM. WE CAN PLAN TO DRIVE BACK THAT SAME EVENING (FRIDAY) OR SPEND ANOTHER NIGHT AND DEPART EARLY ON SATURDAY MORNING. WE WILL ASK EVERYONE GOING TO CONTRIBUTE \$20 TOWARDS COSTS – NOT INCLUDING HOTELS</p>
---	--	--

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 two 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 (if joining a class by zoom):

Communication will largely be accomplished via the Moodle platform utilized by EMU and your EMU email. Check both frequently during the semester. In addition, during class synchronous sessions, it will be expected that you will use a noise-reducing headset to minimize background noise and disruption. Remember to keep your headsets UNMUTED during the sessions and avoid moving, brushing, touching or fumbling with them as it creates unwanted noise in the class space.

Graduate & Professional Studies Writing Center:

Please utilize the [writing program](#)! They offer free individual tutoring from a graduate student tutor. Please visit the website to schedule an appointment.

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](#) in the Academic Success Center on the third floor of the Hartzler Library. They will work with you to establish eligibility and to coordinate reasonable accommodations. All information and documentation is treated confidentially.

Class Attendance:

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) 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 he/she will keep the information as private as he/she 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 <i>(quality of the information, ideas and supporting details)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows clarity of purpose offers depth of content applies insight and represents original thinking follows guidelines for content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows some clarity of purpose offers some depth of content applies some insight and some original thinking mostly follows guidelines for content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <i>(logical order or sequence of the writing)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows coherence, and logically developed paragraphs uses very effective transitions between ideas and sections constructs appropriate introduction and conclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows some coherence and some logically developed paragraphs uses some effective transitions between ideas & sections shows some construction of appropriate introduction and conclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <i>(appropriate attention to audience)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is concise, eloquent and rhetorically effective effectively uses correct, varied and concise sentence structure is engaging to read writes appropriately for audience and purpose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <i>(locating, evaluating, and using effectively the needed information as appropriate to assignment)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <i>(appropriate acknowledgment of sources used in research)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <i>(adherence to grammar rules: usage, spelling & mechanics of Standard Edited English or SEE)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> makes virtually no errors in SEE conventions makes accurate word choices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> makes some errors SEE conventions almost always makes accurate word choices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> makes many errors in SEE conventions makes many inaccurate word choices 	
<p>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).</p>				

Criteria for Evaluating Arts-Based Peacebuilding Projects

CRITERIA	A – Excellent	B – Minimal expectations	C – Below expectations	Comments
Goals & Audience <i>Are the goals or learning objectives of the project clear? Have they been met?</i> <i>Is the intended audience clearly specified?</i> <i>Is the project appropriate for this audience?</i> <i>Does the project communicate to the intended audience?</i>	-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 <i>Is the overall methodology clear and appropriately used?</i> <i>Has the project incorporated specific methods required by the assignment?</i> <i>If intended as a form of intervention, has thought be given to how it will be implemented?</i>	-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 <i>Is there evidence of critical thinking and analysis?</i>	- 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 <i>Is the level of artistic and/or technical craft adequate for the specified goals and audience?</i>	- level of craft is clearly adequate for the audience & to meet project goals (whether or not it meets “artistic” standards) -project is coherent & likely to resonate	-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	

<p><i>Did it involve an appropriate amount of work?</i> <i>Does the final product have coherence and “resonance?”</i></p>	<p>with the intended audience -product shows an appropriate amount of effort for this assignment</p>			
<p>Content <i>Is the content appropriate & adequate, given the goals, audience & assignment?</i> <i>Is there evidence of insight, originality &/or creativity?</i></p>	<p>- information conveyed is clearly adequate for goals, audience & assignment -shows depth & breadth of content -shows insight, originality &/or creativity</p>	<p>-information conveyed is adequate but could be strengthened -some evidence of insight, originality, or creativity</p>	<p>-inadequate information -little or no evidence of insight, originality and/or creativity</p>	
				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).