THE EDUCATION UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Course Outline

Part I

Programme Title : All Undergraduate programmes

Programme QF Level : 5

Course Title : Coalition Building and Policy Advocacy

Course Code : PUA4030

Department : Social Sciences and Policy Studies

Credit Points : 3
Contact Hours : 39
Pre-requisite(s) : Nil
Medium of Instruction : EMI
Course Level : 4

Part II

The University's Graduate Attributes and seven Generic Intended Learning Outcomes (GILOs) represent the attributes of ideal EdUHK graduates and their expected qualities respectively. Learning outcomes work coherently at the University (GILOs), programme (Programme Intended Learning Outcomes) and course (Course Intended Learning Outcomes) levels to achieve the goal of nurturing students with important graduate attributes.

In gist, the Graduate Attributes for Sub-degree, Undergraduate, Taught Postgraduate, Professional Doctorate and Research Postgraduate students consist of the following three domains (i.e. in short "PEER & I"):

- **★** Professional Excellence;
- ★ Ethical Responsibility; &
- **★** Innovation.

The descriptors under these three domains are different for the three groups of students in order to reflect the respective level of Graduate Attributes.

The seven GILOs are:

- 1. Problem Solving Skills
- 2. Critical Thinking Skills
- 3. Creative Thinking Skills
- 4a. Oral Communication Skills
- 4b. Written Communication Skills
- 5. Social Interaction Skills
- 6. Ethical Decision Making
- 7. Global Perspectives

1. Course Synopsis

This course explores knowledge and skills necessary in engaging stakeholders and building coalition in public advocacy. Using real life cases, we introduce students to: (1) The Policy Paradox, which provides a framework for understanding political decision making and the struggles of different stakeholders over values and ideas; (2) Advocacy tools, processes, and models which enable students to understand advocacy formulation, implementation and evaluation; (3) Community engagement and empowerment, in which the emphasis is put on social policies and how to engage the community and the vulnerable population to build advocacy practices in a systematic and purposeful way; and (4) Social Media and Advocacy, which discusses how to engage social media and evaluates the media's role in driving social changes. Ultimately, we train students to be creative and logical thinkers in strategizing advocacy and to become competent communicators in writing and conversing advocacy strategies.

2. Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

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

- CILO₁ Recognize that stakeholders have different agenda and the paradoxes inherent in achieving equity, efficiency, liberty, and security;
- CILO₂ Demonstrate knowledge and application of communication tools or policy advocacy;
- CILO₃ Master approaches to identifying and analyzing the stakeholders; and
- CILO₄ Formulate and evaluate a stakeholder engagement plan.

3. Content, CILOs and Teaching & Learning Activities

| Course Content | CILOs | Suggested Teaching & Learning Activities | |
|---|---------------------|--|--|
| a. Introduce ways to identify stakeholders, and the | CILO ₁₋₃ | Lectures: Presentation and | |
| impacts of social, political, economic, and | | discussion of the frameworks, | |
| global forces on social policy and practice. | | concepts, practices and | |
| b. Discuss advocacy tools, processes, and models | CILO ₂₋₄ | synthesis of key references | |
| which enable students to understand advocacy | | Tutorials: Students present the | |
| formulation, implementation and evaluation | | chosen topics; comment on the | |
| c. Examine the social policy demands of the | CILO ₃₋₄ | presentations; discuss their | |
| vulnerable population to build advocacy | | views on chosen subject areas | |
| practices in a systematic and purposeful way | | Web and library search | |
| d. Discusses how to engage social media and | CILO ₂₋₄ | Reading lecture notes and key | |
| evaluates the media's role in driving social | | references | |
| changes | | | |

4. Assessment

| Assessment Tasks | Weighting (%) | CILOs |
|---|---------------|---------------------|
| (a) Class Discussion and Participation: | 20% | CILO ₁₋₄ |
| Active class participation in leading and contributing to class | | |
| discussion of readings and major issues/themes introduced in | | |
| lectures. | | |
| (b) Practicum and Organizational Observation/Analysis: | 50% | CILO ₁₋₄ |
| - Working in groups, students will be assigned an organization | | |
| (normally Hong Kong based) whom they will conduct an in- | | |
| depth examination to ascertain their engagement and advocacy | | |
| strategies. Students will be required to analyze the strategic | | |
| engagement strategies of their assigned organization and assess | | |
| the outcomes by identified appropriate methods, metrics of | | |
| assessment and mapping these with key organizational objectives | | |
| in terms of advocacy outcomes and effectiveness (30%). | | |
| - Every student is required to keep and submit a reflective journal | | |
| to include a summary of short reflections and observations on | | |
| group activities undertaken during the course and include further | | |
| discussion of relevant theories and literature (2500, +/- 10%) | | |
| (20%) | | |
| (c) Reflection Paper | 30% | $CILO_{1-4}$ |
| A political autobiography with no more than 1500 words on how | | |
| each student has advocacy in their personal lives and how that | | |
| influenced them. | | |

5. Use of Generative AI in Course Assessments

Please select one option only that applies to this course:

Not Permitted: In this course, the use of generative AI tools is not allowed for any assessment tasks.

☑ Permitted: In this course, generative AI tools may be used in some or all assessment tasks. Instructors will provide specific instructions, including any restrictions or additional requirements (e.g., proper acknowledgment, reflective reports), during the first lesson and in relevant assessment briefs.

6. Required Text(s)

Nil

7. Recommended Readings

- Aakhus, M., & Bzdak, M. (2015). Stakeholder engagement as communication design practice. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 15(2), 188-200.
- Arnold, G. (2011). The impact of social ties on coalition strength and effectiveness: The case of the battered women's movement in St. Louis. *Social Movement Studies*, 10(2), 131–150.
- Bergan, D. E. (2009). Does grassroots lobbying work? A field experiment measuring the effects of an e-mail lobbying campaign on legislative behavior. *American Political Research*, 37, 327-352.
- Gelak, D. (2008). Lobbying and advocacy: Winning strategies, resources, recommendations, ethics and ongoing compliance for lobbyists and Washington Advocates. Washington: Thecapitol.Net, Inc.
- McNutt, J. (2011). Is social work advocacy worth the cost? Issues and barriers to an economic analysis of social work political practice. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 21(4), 397–403.
- McNutt, J. G. (2006). Building evidence based advocacy in cyberspace: A social work imperative for the new millennium. *Journal of Evidence Based Practice*, 3, 91-102.
- Patton, M. (2008). Advocacy impact Evaluation. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*, 5(9), http://evaluation.wmich.edu/jmde/
- Raiffa, H. (1982). *The art and science of negotiation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Richan, W.C. (1996). *Lobbying for social change*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Rocha, C., Poe, B. & Thomas, V. (2010). Political activities of social workers: Addressing perceived barriers to political participation. *Social Work*, 55(4), 317-325.
- Shaw, R. (1996). *The activist's handbook: A primer*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Stone, D. (2011). *Policy Paradox: The art of political decision making*. (3rd ed.). New York: Norton.
- Terzieva, M., & Morabito, V. (2016). Learning from experience: The project team is key. *Business Systems Research*, 7(1), 1-15.

8. Related Web Resources

e.politics: http://epolitics.com/

Abramoff: The lobbyist's playbook (60 minutes): http://www.cbsnews.com/video/watch/?id=7387331n

NetCentric Advocacy: http://www.network-centricadvocacy.net

Center for Civil Society Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong:

http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/centre/ccss/index.html

Center for the Third Sector, National Chengchi University (政治大學第三部門研究中心): http://tw.funwish.net/nccu333/?p=47

NGO Research Center, Tsinghua University (清華大學, 清華 NGO 研究所):

http://www.ngorc.org.cn/

Tactical Technology Collective: http://www.tactictech.org

9. Related Journals

American Political Science Review Journal of Contemporary Asia Social Movement Studies Social Work The Pacific Review

Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations

10. Academic Honesty

The University upholds the principles of honesty in all areas of academic work. We expect our students to carry out all academic activities honestly and in good faith. Please refer to the *Policy on Academic Honesty, Responsibility and Integrity* (https://www.eduhk.hk/re/uploads/docs/000000000016336798924548BbN5). Students should familiarize themselves with the Policy.

11. Others

Newspaper articles, policy papers and video-clips on relevant issues.

Last updated: 11 July 2025