Application Assignment 2: Part 2 - Developing an Advocacy Campaign

The following application, Part 2, will be due in Week 7.

**To prepare:**

* Review Chapter 3 of Milstead, J. A. (2016). *Health policy and politics: A nurse’s guide*(5th ed.). Burlington, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
* In the first assignment, you reflected on whether the policy you would like to promote could best be achieved through the development of new legislation, or a change in an existing law or regulation. Refine as necessary using any feedback from your first paper.
* Contemplate how existing laws or regulations may affect how you proceed in advocating for your proposed policy.
* Consider how you could influence legislators or other policymakers to enact the policy you propose.
* Think about the obstacles of the legislative process that may prevent your proposed policy from being implemented as intended.

**To complete:**

Part Two will have approximately 3–4 pages of content plus a title page and references. Part Two will address the following:

* Explain whether your proposed policy could be enacted through a modification of existing law or regulation or the creation of new legislation/regulation.
* Explain how existing laws or regulations could affect your advocacy efforts. Be sure to cite and reference the laws and regulations using primary sources.
* Provide an analysis of the methods you could use to influence legislators or other policymakers to support your policy. In particular, explain how you would use the “three legs” of lobbying in your advocacy efforts.
	+ Summarize obstacles that could arise in the legislative process and how to overcome these hurdles.
	+ Paste the rubric at the end of your paper.

By Day 7 of Week 7

This Assignment is due.

Content-Main Posting

30 (30%) - 30 (30%)

-Main posting addresses all criteria with 75% of post exceptional depth and breadth supported by credible references

27 (27%) - 29 (29%)

-Main posting addresses all criteria with 75% of post exceptional depth and breadth supported by credible references

24 (24%) - 26 (26%)

Main posting meets expectations. All criteria are addressed with 50% containing good breadth and depth.

21 (21%) - 23 (23%)

Main posting addresses most of the criteria. One to two criterion are not addressed or superficially addressed.

0 (0%) - 20 (20%)

Main posting does not address all of criteria, superficially addresses criteria. Two or more criteria are not addressed.

Course Requirements and Attendance

20 (20%) - 20 (20%)

-Responds to two colleagues’ with posts that are reflective, are justified with credible sources, and ask questions that extend the discussion.

18 (18%) - 19 (19%)

-Responds to two colleagues’ with posts that are reflective, are justified with credible sources, and ask questions that extend the discussion.

16 (16%) - 17 (17%)

Responds to a minimum of two colleagues’ posts, are reflective, and ask questions that extend the discussion. One post is justified by a credible source.

14 (14%) - 15 (15%)

Responds to less than two colleagues’ posts. Posts are on topic, may have some depth, or questions. May extend the discussion. No credible sources are cited

0 (0%) - 13 (13%)

Responds to less than two colleagues’ posts. Posts may not be on topic, lack depth, do not pose questions that extend the discussion

Scholarly Writing Quality

30 (30%) - 30 (30%)

-The main posting clearly addresses the discussion criteria and is written concisely. The main posting is cited with more than two credible references that adhere to the correct format per the APA Manual 6th Edition. No spelling or grammatical errors. \*\*\*The use of scholarly sources or real life experiences needs to be included to deepen the discussion and earn points in reply to fellow students.

27 (27%) - 29 (29%)

-The main posting clearly addresses the discussion criteria and is written concisely. The main posting is cited with more than two credible references that adhere to the correct format per the APA Manual 6th Edition. No spelling or grammatical errors.

24 (24%) - 26 (26%)

-The main posting clearly addresses the discussion criteria and is written concisely. The main posting is cited with a minimum of two current credible references that adhere to the correct format per the APA Manual 6th Edition. Contains one to two spelling or grammatical errors.

21 (21%) - 23 (23%)

-The main posting is not clearly addressing the discussion criteria and is not written concisely. The main posting is cited with less than two credible references that may lack credibility and/or do not adhere to the correct format per the APA Manual 6th Edition. Contains more than two spelling or grammatical errors.

0 (0%) - 20 (20%)

-The main posting is disorganized and has one reference that may lack credibility and does not adhere to the correct format per the APA Manual 6th Edition or has zero credible references. Contains more than two spelling or grammatical errors.

Professional

Communication

Effectiveness

20 (20%) - 20 (20%)

-Communication is professional and respectful to colleagues and response to faculty questions are answered if posed. Provides clear, concise opinions and ideas effectively written in Standard Edited English -Responses posted in the discussion demonstrate effective professional communication through deep reflective discussion which leads to an exchange of ideas and focus on the weekly discussion topic.

18 (18%) - 19 (19%)

-Communication is professional and respectful to colleagues. -Provides clear, concise opinions and ideas effectively written in Standard Edited English -Responses posted in the discussion demonstrate effective professional communication through deep reflective discussion which leads to an exchange of ideas and focus on the weekly discussion topic . -Responses are cited with at least one credible reference per post and a probing question that extends the discussion. Adheres to the correct format per the APA Manual 6th Edition. No spelling or grammatical errors.

16 (16%) - 17 (17%)

-Communication is professional and respectful to colleagues. Provides clear, concise opinions and ideas effectively written in Standard Edited English. -Responses posted in the discussion demonstrate effective professional communication through deep reflective discussion which leads to an exchange of ideas and focus on the weekly discussion topic. -Responses are cited with at least one credible and/or contain probing questions that extends the discussion. Adheres to the correct format per the APA Manual 6th Edition. May have one to two spelling or grammatical errors.

14 (14%) - 15 (15%)

-Communication is professional and respectful to colleagues. Provides opinions that may not be concise or ideas not effectively written in Standard Edited English. -Responses posted in the discussion may lack effective professional communication that does not extend the discussion, leads to an exchange of ideas and/or not focused on the weekly discussion topic. -Responses are not cited and/or do not contain a probing question. May not adhere to the correct format per the APA Manual 6th Edition. May have more than two spelling or grammatical errors.

0 (0%) - 13 (13%)

-Communication may lack professional tone or be disrespectful to colleagues. Provides opinions that may not be concise or ideas not effectively written in Standard Edited English -Responses posted in the discussion lack effective professional communication through discussion that does not extend the discussion, do not lead to an exchange of ideas and/or not focused on the weekly discussion topic. -Responses are not cited and do not contain a probing question. May not adhere to the correct format per the APA Manual 6th Edition. May have multiple spelling or grammatical errors.

Timely Submission

0 (0%) - 0 (0%)

All criteria met: Initial post submitted on time. Response to two peer initial posts. Response on 3 separate days.

-5 (-5%) - 0 (0%)

5 points deducted for responding to less than two peers or 5 points deducted for responding less than three days

-10 (-10%) - -5 (-5%)

5 points deducted for responding to less than two peers and 5 points deducted for responding less than three days

-10 (-10%) - -10 (-10%)

10 points deducted for Initial post submitted late

-20 (-20%) - -15 (-15%)

Initial post submitted late and 5 points deducted for responding to less than two peers and/ or 5 points deducted for responding less than three days