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**Course description**

This course offers a broad overview of the field of political communication and public diplomacy. It will connect public diplomacy to the study of power, influence and strategy in international and global politics. During the course we will discuss and apply theories regarding 1) the making of international communication strategies (priming, framing, agenda setting; impression management); 2) the changing relationship between media and politics (journalistic role perceptions); and 3) diplomacy and soft power; 4) the role and major dimensions of Public diplomacy (e.g. cultural diplomacy, advocacy; exchange diplomacy; international broadcasting).

**Course Learning Objectives (CLO)**

The course familiarizes students with the core concepts involved in the study of public diplomacy.

**Specific Objectives**

1. Familiarize students with the core conceptual and theoretical tenets that underpin the study of public diplomacy;
2. To learn the motivations, strategies and methods of key international groups and individuals, as well as the responses developed by state agencies.
3. Acquire a general understanding of the interdisciplinary of the field and the ability to define core concepts used in political communication and public diplomacy;
4. Acquire the ability to apply theories of public diplomacy to specific real-life examples.
5. Learn how to formulate, present and defend a public diplomacy strategy and be exposed to unfamiliar perspectives.
6. Acquire/refine the ability to conduct and frame a paper drawing on theoretical and empirical data.
7. Acquire/refine the ability to present research findings in oral and written form.
8. Ability to recognize, accept and respect a variety of different perspectives

**LINK BETWEEN PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES, COURSE OBJECTIVES, TEACHING METHODS, ASSIGNMENTS AND FEEDBACK**

**Summary:**
Number of assignments used in this course: 3
Number of Feedback occasions in this course (either written or oral): 3+
Number and Types of Teaching Methods: Lectures, seminars, discussions, exercises, final simulation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Course Learning objectives addressing the Programme Objectives (testable learning objectives)</th>
<th>Methods used to Teach Course Objectives (and numbers/types of assignments) used to test these learning objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Knowledge of major theories and core concepts of international relations (IR) and diplomacy and global governance from a Western and global perspective</td>
<td>Familiarize students with the core conceptual and theoretical tenets that underpin the study of public diplomacy;</td>
<td>Final paper, written speech, simulation Feedback to the presentation Written feedback to the essay and speech; Informal feedback throughout the course during the seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Knowledge of the historical evolution of the concepts and practice of Diplomacy and Global Governance and their relationship to major processes, developments and dynamics related to the emergence of core global policy challenges</td>
<td>Learn the historical and contextual evolutions of the study and practice of public diplomacy</td>
<td>Final paper, seminar sessions, simulation Feedback to the presentation Written feedback to the essay and speech; Informal feedback throughout the course during the seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Knowledge of core actors, organizations and players at the national, regional and global level – both in the state- and non-state actor realm</td>
<td>To learn the motivations, strategies and methods of key international groups and individuals, as well as the responses developed by state agencies.</td>
<td>Final paper, seminar sessions, simulation Feedback to the presentation Written feedback to the essay and speech; Informal feedback throughout the course during the seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1. Ability to apply interdisciplinary knowledge and understanding to concrete ‘real-life’ issues and challenges in the areas of diplomacy and global governance</td>
<td>Acquire a general understanding of the interdisciplinary of the field and the ability to define core concepts used in political communication and public diplomacy</td>
<td>Final paper, seminar sessions, simulation Feedback to the presentation Written feedback to the paper and speech; Informal feedback throughout the course during the seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Ability to confidently develop and apply ideas and arguments emanating from theory, concepts and paradigms in the formulation of academic and/or policy-relevant analyses</td>
<td>Acquire the ability to apply theories of public diplomacy to specific real-life examples.</td>
<td>Final paper on the national public diplomacy strategy; speech, simulation Written feedback to the paper and speech; Informal feedback throughout the course during the seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Learning Objectives</td>
<td>Course Learning objectives addressing the Programme Objectives (testable learning objectives)</td>
<td>Methods used to Teach Course Objectives and numbers/types of assignments) used to test these learning objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Ability to demonstrate and apply professional skills through simulations professional workshops, internships or the Capstone Practicum Course</td>
<td>Learn how to formulate, present and defend a public diplomacy strategy and To be exposed to unfamiliar perspectives.</td>
<td>Final paper on the national public diplomacy strategy; speech, simulation Written feedback to the paper and speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. Ability to communicate arguments, recommendations and research results in a convincing, precise, effective manner in written form</td>
<td>Develop the ability to conduct and frame a paper drawing on theoretical and empirical data. Develop the ability to present research findings in written form.</td>
<td>Final paper on the national public diplomacy strategy Speech writing Written feedback to the paper and speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Ability to communicate arguments, recommendations and research results in convincing, precise, effective manner through the spoken word</td>
<td>Develop the ability to present research findings in oral form.</td>
<td>Speech writing; performance in the simulation Written feedback to the speech and performance in the simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2. Intercultural awareness and sensitivity to different cultures, backgrounds and perspectives</td>
<td>Ability to recognize, accept and respect a variety of different perspectives</td>
<td>Final Simulation Written feedback to the speech and performance in the simulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structure of the course

The course is structured into two main parts:

1. Links to power and insights from International Communication and IR theories; and
2. Components of Public Diplomacy;

The class is based on both lectures and seminars. The lectures introduce the topic of the day. The seminars offer the possibility of familiarizing in a dynamic way with the main concepts, theories and issues learnt throughout the course. Reading in advance and getting prepared for both lectures and seminars is, therefore, a fundamental requirement of the course. Please, note unannounced that reading texts will regularly take place.

The seminars will mainly pursue a double-edged role:

1. They will allow students to lead a seminar based on the seminar readings;
2. They will give students the possibility of working on and discussing the state of the art of their national case studies (see below for further instructions).

Main Course Materials (please note that you can find the readings for each week and session in the Course Schedule section below):

The course material consists of powerpoint presentations, lecture notes, readings from the textbook and academic articles. Powerpoint presentations will be made available after the respective classes have taken place. A week-by-week overview of the course readings can be found in the section below.

The syllabus, powerpoint presentations and important messages will be uploaded to the Vesalius portal ‘Canvas’. Students are expected to visit this site regularly to keep abreast of course evolutions. The professor is expected to upload relevant material in a timely manner.

Course material marked as ‘suggested readings’ and ‘additional sources’ is helpful for research and to gain an increased understanding but is not mandatory. This material can be found online or will be made available upon individual request.

Textbooks


Recommended References books:


**Active Learning and Intensive ‘Reading around the Subject’: Additional Sources, Recommended Journals and Websites:**

Learning should be an active and self-motivated experience. Students who passively listen to lectures, copy someone else’s notes, and limit their readings to required chapters are unlikely to develop their critical thinking and expand their personal knowledge system. At the exam, these students often fail to demonstrate a critical approach. Students are strongly recommended to have an updated understanding of developments related to this course and related to their wider Major. Active and engaged learning will turn out to be enriching to the overall course and class discussions. Students are invited to deepen their understanding of both theoretical and current issues from a variety of sources. Please find a list of suggestions compassing the entire course below. You are encouraged to read and browse in the leading journals of your discipline.

**Leading Journals in IR and Public Diplomacy Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy Analysis</td>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td>International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review of Political Science</td>
<td>International Interaction</td>
<td>International Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of International Relations</td>
<td>International Organization</td>
<td>Review of International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Conflict</td>
<td>Security Dialogue</td>
<td>International Relations of the Asia Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Quarterly</td>
<td>International Studies Review</td>
<td>Global Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Studies</td>
<td>Journal of Common Market Studies</td>
<td>World Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Security Policies</td>
<td>Asian Security</td>
<td>European Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Politics</td>
<td>Millennium: Journal of International Studies</td>
<td>Journal of Peace Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</td>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Branding and Public Diplomacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Useful Resources and Website

The United Nations Foundation suggests a list of five online resources to get acquainted with Public Diplomacy (https://unfoundation.org/blog/post/5-resources-for-public-diplomacy-professionals/):

1. **USC Center on Public Diplomacy** – a partnership between the Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism and the USC School of International Relations - https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org


3. **Shorenstein Center at Harvard Kennedy School** – https://shorensteincenter.org – among other resources, produces a weekly “Media and Politics must read” list.


5. **Diplomatic Courier** – https://www.diplomaticourier.com

In addition to this, you may want to check out: GW’s Institute for Public Diplomacy and Global Communication, Robin Brown’s Network and Influence Blog, Winnowing Fan website, Marc Lynch’s *Foreign Policy* blog, Craig Hayden’s Intermap blog, Steve Corman’s Consortium for Strategic Communication, The US Department of State’s Discover Diplomacy website, publicdiplomacy.wikia.com, the Public Diplomacy reading list at the Netherlands Institute of International Relations’ Clingendael, Nick Cull and Ali Fisher’s The Playbook: Case Studies of Engagement, and the Public Diplomacy Council’s Academic Study website, Bruce Gregory’s Public Diplomacy Reading List.

**Work Load Calculation for this Course:**

This course counts for 6 ECTS, which translates into 150 – 180 hours for the entire semester for this course. This means that you are expected to spend roughly 10 hours per week on this course. This includes 2 hours of lectures or seminars per week and 7 hours ‘out of class’ time spent on preparatory readings, studying time for exams as well as time spent on preparing your assignments. Please see below the estimated breakdown of your work-load for this course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class &amp; meetings (2 hours per week for 13 weeks)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course reading (460 pages, 10 pages / hr)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 1: National Public Diplomatic Strategy</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 2: Written Speech and preparation for the delivery</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying and preparing for the seminars</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>162</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Course Schedule

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>W1</strong></td>
<td>9/02</td>
<td>Intro to the course – Diplomacy, Old and New – Definitions, perspectives, actors and challenges: Still a world of states?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 1 – Theoretical toolkit – Links to power; insights from Political Communication and IRTs**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>W2</strong></td>
<td>16/02</td>
<td>Soft Power, grand strategy and public diplomacy – the power of words and the word of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W3</strong></td>
<td>23/02</td>
<td>The new communication ecology: the rise of digital diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W4</strong></td>
<td>2/03</td>
<td>Strategising Public Diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W5</strong></td>
<td>9/03</td>
<td>Political Rhetoric for effective speech writing and delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 2 – Components of Public Diplomacy**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>W6</strong></td>
<td>16/03</td>
<td>Public Diplomacy (or Propaganda?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W7</strong></td>
<td>23/03</td>
<td>Listening (or intelligence gathering?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W8</strong></td>
<td>30/03</td>
<td>Advocacy and Public Diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W9</strong></td>
<td>20/04</td>
<td>Nation Branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W10</strong></td>
<td>27/04</td>
<td>Cultural Diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W11</strong></td>
<td>4/05</td>
<td>Broadcasting and social media: different channels same effectiveness? (paper due!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W12</strong></td>
<td>11/05</td>
<td>Trade diplomacy (Guest lecture Dr Sven Van Kerckhoven)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W13</strong></td>
<td>18/05</td>
<td>Reading week (speech due!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W14</strong></td>
<td>25/05</td>
<td>Ambassadors for one day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W15</strong></td>
<td>5/06</td>
<td>Ambassadors for one day (if needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Course Schedule

W1 – Intro to the course – Diplomacy, Old and New – Definitions, perspectives, actors and challenges: Still a world of states?

Readings:


Recommended readings:


In-class activities: Discussing activities and assigning tasks and presentations.

**W2 – Soft Power, grand strategy and public diplomacy – the power of words and the word of power**

Readings:


Recommended readings:


In-class activities: Seminar session

W3 – The new communication ecology: the rise of digital diplomacy

Readings:


Recommended readings:


In-class activities: Seminar session

W4 – Strategising Public Diplomacy

Readings:


Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada (2019) “Cultural Diplomacy at the front stage of Canada’s Foreign Policy”, June 2019, Ottawa: Senate, available at: https://sencanada.ca/content/sen/committee/421/AEFA/Reports/Report_CulturalDiplomacy_e.pdf


Further readings:


Glance at the structure and contents of these sample strategies: you do not need to read them all, as long as you understand how to structure the public diplomacy strategy of your selected state.


**W5 – Political Rhetoric for effective speech writing and delivery**

**Readings:**


**Recommended Readings:**
Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* Book I, Chapters 1 (rhetoric and dialectic), 2 (the functions of rhetoric and effects of persuasion), 3 (the three classes of speech), 4 (rhetoric and political counsels), and Book II, Chapters 1 (rhetorical appeals), 2, 3, 4, 5 (emotions), 22 (enthymeme), 23, 24 (Lines of proof and argument) widely available online, for instance here: [http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/Aristotle-rhetoric.pdf](http://www.bocc.ubi.pt/pag/Aristotle-rhetoric.pdf)


Further readings:


Mudric, M (2016) “Key skills for the next generation of diplomats”, Diplo, available at: [https://www.diplomacy.edu/blog/key-skills-next-generation-diplomats](https://www.diplomacy.edu/blog/key-skills-next-generation-diplomats)


**In-class activities:** During this class we will apprehend and draw practical lessons on how to use effectively political rhetoric in framing arguments, writing and delivery political speeches. Use the suggested list of readings to write your speech and prepare for its delivery in the framework of our simulation.
**In-class activities:** Based on the toolkit studied so far: *Identify the main sources of soft power of your assigned states; Review the strategies that they have elaborated so far; Find the actors that best networks to push your public diplomacy agenda.*

**Research speed-dating section:** *How do your colleagues perceive your assigned state? How do you want to frame its international image?*

**W6 – Public Diplomacy (or Propaganda?)**

**Readings:**


**Recommended readings:**


**In-class activities:** Watching documentaries:

Documentary. 1946. “A defeated People”. British documentary published by The Best Film Archives on July 24 2014, available at: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x8XG-nbM3BE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x8XG-nbM3BE)
Documentary. 1945. “WW2 Training Film for US Troops Occupying Germany; Your Job in Germany, US Army documentary published by The Best Film Archives on September 2 2017, available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fChEFjADTTs

W 7 – Listening (or intelligence gathering?)

Readings


Obama B (2009) Remarks by the President on a New Beginning. The White House, 4 June. Available at: www.whitehouse.gov/blog/NewBeginning

Recommended readings


In-class activities: Seminar session

W 8 – Advocacy and Public Diplomacy

Readings


**Recommended readings**


**In-class activities:** Seminar session

**W9 – Nation Branding**

**Readings:**


Recommended readings:


In-class activities: Based on the toolkit studied so far: Work on your own branding: what are the most fundamental symbols that constitute your brand? Make your reality-check: Match your symbols against perceived soft power capital – is it widely recognized? Identify the core components of your strategy: are you going to bet on culture, political issues, networks? Which tools are important?

Research speed-dating section: how do your colleagues perceive your assigned state? How do you want to frame its international image?

W10 – Cultural Diplomacy


Recommended readings


In-class activities: Seminar session

W11 – Broadcasting and social media: different channels same effectiveness?

Readings


Recommended readings:


In-class activities: Seminar session

W12 – Trade diplomacy

Readings:


Further readings:


Grading Scale of Vesalius College

Vesalius College grading policy follows the American system of letter grades, which correspond to a point scale from 0 – 100. All assignments (including exams) must be graded on the scale of 0-100. To comply with the Flemish Educational norms, professors should on request also provide the conversion of the grade on the Flemish scale of 0-20. The conversion table below outlines the grade equivalents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter grade</th>
<th>Scale of 100 (VeCo Grading Scale)</th>
<th>Scale of 20 (Flemish System)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>85-100</td>
<td>17.0-20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>81-84</td>
<td>16.1-16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>77-80</td>
<td>15.3-16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>73-76</td>
<td>14.5-15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>69-72</td>
<td>13.7-14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>66-68</td>
<td>13.1-13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>12.3-13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>58-61</td>
<td>11.5-12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>54-57</td>
<td>10.7-11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>50-53</td>
<td>10.0-10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>0-9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Assessment: Assignments Overview

Strategy Paper                                      50 %
Speech writing                                       30 %
Delivery of the speech                               20 %

Key deadlines

Strategy Paper                                      W11
Speech writing                                       W13
Delivery of the speech                               W14
Description of Activities, Grading Criteria and Deadlines

A. Policy paper – A country-specific public diplomacy strategy

You must submit your paper on Canvas by W11 (May 4). Use an informative file name (for example, “Kim POL4XXM paper”) when you upload it on Canvas and make sure that your name is on the first page as well.

Select one of these countries: 1) Australia 2) Brazil 3) Canada 4) China 5) France 6) Germany 7) India 8) Iran; 9) Israel; 10) Italy 11) Japan 12) Russian Federation 13) Spain 14) South Africa 15) South Korea 16) Taiwan; 17) United Kingdom and 18) United States.

You are required to write a 2500-3000-word paper that a) analyses the main strategies adopted by a given country and b) proposes up to five policy suggestions to advance the country’s profile by means of public diplomatic activities.

The paper will be composed by four main parts and structured as follows:

| Introduction | The introduction anticipates some background information of the research. It gives some information on the strategy (if any) that the selected country has adopted in order to perform effective public diplomacy activities. It identifies both merits and limits of the current attempts to set up a coherent and effective public diplomacy strategy. It relates back to the main components of public diplomacy (e.g. cultural diplomacy, broadcasting, social media, etc.) and pushes forwards an original proposal to strengthen a given country’s public diplomacy strategy. The final part of the introduction sums up the structure of the research.

Checklist: Introduce key factual information to understand your case study; Identify the puzzle of the research; Highlight the most problematic/worth-exploring aspects of your selected topic; Contextualize the topic within the academic debate; Outline briefly the structure of the paper and your main argument. |
| Part two – Conceptual and methodological section | Part two introduces the main conceptual and methodological foundations of the suggested analysis. It provides for relevant definitions; reviews the literature and explains the research design and main hypothesis. This section adequately justifies the relevance of the selection of this theories/concepts for the proposed analysis.

Checklist: Identify a relevant concept/theory that you will adopt in the analysis; Sum up the definition of your concept/core assumptions of the theory under enquiry and review critically the core arguments of most representative scholars; Explain how and |
to what extent this concept/theory is relevant for your case study; Make sure that your selected concept/theory fits well your analysis!

| Part three – Analysis of relevant trends | This part describes the main strategies that underpin the selected country’s public diplomacy strategy (or a given component of it, e.g. cultural diplomacy, broadcasting). It identifies the main steps of its evolution, the general institutional and networking structure. Based on the country’s strategy, it describes the areas that have been prioritized so far (e.g. bilateral relations; social media, cultural diplomacy, broadcasting, to quote but a few examples) and assesses the extent to which this choice has been effective and to what purposes. This part also describes the kind of image that a given country is trying to convey by means of public or cultural diplomacy. Data and sources should complement the analysis. Your core argument should be validated by evidence and supported by data and empirical findings.  

**Checklist**: Draw on facts, empirical examples and data to analyze your topic; use and synthesize sources and references to support your key arguments; refer to your conceptual definitions/ core assumptions of your selected theory in your analysis. |

| Part 4 – Policy suggestions and concluding remarks | Based on the strengths and weaknesses of the country’s diplomatic strategy, this section advances up to five policy recommendations in order to strengthen a given country’s international profile. Suggestions may extend to an area in which the selected country’s investments are sub-optimal (for the sake of an example, cultural diplomacy) or absent (for the sake of an example, social media strategy). Finally, this section recaps the main foundations and findings of the analysis. It further highlights the main merits and limits of the suggested analysis and identifies avenues for further research.  

**Checklist**: Evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the selected country’s strategy. Based on the analysis of the country’s strength and weaknesses, suggests up to five policy recommendations. Critically assess the most original and relevant aspects of your analysis and identify their limits. Locate your analysis in the wider academic debate and identify avenues for further research. |

---

B. Ambassadors for one day: speech writing and the art of persuasion

During this section you will present the main findings of your paper. The presentation will be delivered as a formal speech (5-7 minutes) and will be followed by a Q&A session (5 minutes). The speech needs to be written in advance. **Submit on Canvas a 1000-1500-word speech (5-7 minutes) by W13 (May 18).**
You will formally act as an ambassador/member of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of your selected country, debriefing the President/Prime Minister on the state of the public diplomacy strategy pursued by your country.

The speech will introduce some contextual information on your assigned country’s international image, it will advocate for the need of a new public diplomacy strategy and will advance your policy recommendations.

The speech consists of an act of persuasion, so make sure you will exercise your rhetorical skills at best! It is reported that Demosthenes, the great Athenian orator, would run every morning while reciting aloud the Homeric epics after having previously filled his mouth with pebbles. Obviously, you would not be expected to be as zealous as Demosthenes. Fortunately, below are a few recommendations that should help you:

## Grading Rubrics for Assignments

### A. Grading rubric for the research paper (50% of the final grade)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Rubric</th>
<th>Fail 0-49</th>
<th>Low pass 57-50</th>
<th>Pass 68-58</th>
<th>Good 80-69</th>
<th>Excellent 81-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>The core components of the analysis are irrelevant or not well identified; the topic is not contextualized; the outline is absent or flawed.</td>
<td>The core components of the analysis are defined in an unclear way; the topic is not adequately contextualized; the outline is flawed</td>
<td>The introduction gives sufficient information on the core components of the analysis, the topic and the outline. A combination of flaws hinders the author’s argument.</td>
<td>Good ability to identify the core components of the analysis. Some redundancies. The outline is overall good and background information is relevant.</td>
<td>Excellent ability to identify the core components of the analysis; clear and concise research statement; Succinct outline of structure of the paper and main argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewing, understanding and application of theories</strong></td>
<td>No mention of concepts or theories. The literature review shows no engagement with the course material. Severe conceptual or theoretical oversimplification.</td>
<td>Concepts or theories are simply mentioned. The literature review shows weak engagement with the course material. Significant conceptual or theoretical oversimplification.</td>
<td>Sufficient engagement with conceptual or theoretical arguments; not all information provided is relevant to the analysis or the research question. The literature review shows basic critical engagement.</td>
<td>Overall, the literature review is well conceived. Some minor imprecision in the selection of the literature and the conceptual choice; Some flaws in the selection of the conceptual/theoretical toolkit; fairly good critical abilities.</td>
<td>Excellent identification of academic arguments and debates; Good ability to compare and contrast key arguments; good justification and critical assessment of theoretical frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis/discussion</strong></td>
<td>The analysis shows severe pitfalls; inability to relate conceptual/theoretical frameworks to the selected case study. Information provided is insufficient; the analysis shows severe pitfalls; An insufficient ability to related conceptual/theoretical frameworks to the selected case. Information provided is insufficient; the</td>
<td>The analysis shows severe pitfalls; An insufficient ability to related conceptual/theoretical frameworks to the selected case. Information provided is insufficient; the</td>
<td>Sufficient ability to review relevant facts for the analysis. Core statements are not always supported by reference or evidence; not</td>
<td>Good critical analysis, supported by good information and data; some flaws in the use of data and reference in support of one’s argument; Minor flaws in the argumentative</td>
<td>Extensive analysis supported by updated examples and data; Use of evidence and references; The analytical part reflects a thorough engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>analysis is severely flawed</td>
<td>analysis is superficial</td>
<td>all information is relevant. Basic critical engagement.</td>
<td>line and the conceptual/theoretical framework discussed in the previous section.</td>
<td>with the concepts/theories reviewed; Critical evaluation of core assumptions of other authors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy recommendation and conclusions</strong></td>
<td>The policy recommendation s are inconsistent or inconsequential. The conclusions mainly repeat previous sections; no critical evaluation or reflection on main findings</td>
<td>The policy recommendation s are barely consistent and consequential. The conclusions mostly repeat previous sections; scanty critical evaluation or reflection on main findings</td>
<td>The policy recommendation s are not always realistic or are credible, but not sufficiently grounded in knowledge of the case. The conclusions show some attempts to critically review the main findings; basic engagement with future research avenues.</td>
<td>Good policy recommendation s, based on a discrete understanding of the country and are sustained by an overall considerable work of research. The conclusions show a good ability to engage critically with the topic and assess the main findings. Good identification of avenues for further research.</td>
<td>Excellent policy recommendations, based on a deep understanding of the country’s potential and a sound means-ends calculation. Succinct summary of key findings; Critical and open-minded evaluation of core arguments and results; identification of further avenues of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure and formal aspects</strong></td>
<td>Loose structure; failure to provide most relevant information. Serious mismatch between theory and analysis. Incorrect expression/referencing system; Insufficient readings (less than 5)</td>
<td>The structure is flawed; most relevant information is barely provided; mismatch between theoretical and analytical frameworks; the paper is hard to read; references are not listed correctly; Insufficient readings (less than 7)</td>
<td>Some flaws in the structure of the paper; not all information is relevant; some issues of coherence jeopardise the link between theory and analysis Some flaws in the expression and the</td>
<td>Overall, the paper is well-structured. Some minor flaws in the organization hinder the strength of the argument; Overall correct use of language and referencing system; adequate number of sources (less than 10</td>
<td>Coherent and logical structure; clear argument, linking theories and empirical examples back to answering the main research question. Correct use of language and referencing system;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rubric for the written speech (30% of the final grade)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projection and language</th>
<th>49-00-14.9</th>
<th>50-57</th>
<th>58-68</th>
<th>69-80</th>
<th>81-100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor, dry and incorrect language standards. The author does not manage to use the technical vocabulary of the discipline. Main flaws in the accuracy and presentation of the argument.</td>
<td>Barely satisfactory language standard. Barely sufficient ability to use technical vocabulary of the discipline. Relevant flaws in the development of rhetorical strategies to support his/her argument.</td>
<td>Satisfactory language standard. Sufficient ability to use technical vocabulary of the discipline. Some flaws in the development of rhetorical strategies to support his/her argument.</td>
<td>Good (or fairly good) language standards. Good ability to use the technical vocabulary of the discipline. Some minor flaws in the development of rhetorical strategies to support his/her argument.</td>
<td>Correct, solid and relevant use of the language. Excellent command of the technical vocabulary of the discipline; excellent use of rhetorical strategies to support his /her argument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Organisation and structure | The argument is structured in an unsatisfactory way. Basic analytical elements remain unidentified or under-explored. Main flaws in the organization of the argument. | The argument is structured in a barely satisfactory way. Basic analytical elements are barely identified. Important flaws in the organization of the argument. | Overall, the argument unfolds logically and in a well-structured manner. A few minor flaws in the organization of the main arguments and / or conclusions weaken the strength of the argument. | The argument is based on a clear, logical and original approach to the theoretical and empirical components of the subject in question. The argument is structured in a solid and convincing way |

| Use of sources and data in support of one’s arguments | The speech provides no data in support of the argument. | The speech barely provides any data to support the argument. | Data and sources are generally used satisfactorily. Further reflection on how to relate the evidence to the basic analytical components would have strengthened the strength of the argument. | The data and sources are convincingly and competently deployed in support of her/his statements. |
### Critical ability to relate to and analyze the topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>No critical engagement and a poor understanding of the subject matter. Policy proposals are poorly designed and show insufficient engagement with key ideas, concepts and theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-57</td>
<td>Limited critical engagement and a barely satisfactory understanding of the subject matter. Policy proposals are designed in a barely sufficient way and show a barely sufficient engagement with key ideas, concepts and theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-68</td>
<td>Satisfactory engagement and understanding of the subject matter. Acceptable policy proposal and engagement with key ideas, concepts and theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-80</td>
<td>Good understanding of the subject at hand and good general ability to engage in a critical dialogue with the subject. The subject could have been better developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>Creative, original, competent. Sophisticated understanding of the subject. Excellent ability to formulate policy proposals and use ideas, concepts and theories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delivery of the speech and performance in the simulation (20%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>The speech is poorly executed. It is merely read. The pace, tone of the voice and/or the deliverance makes the speech extremely hard to follow. The speaker does not manage to establish his/her ethical position. The characterization of the speaker is incoherent or poorly conceived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-57</td>
<td>The speech is not well executed. It is mainly read. The pace is too slow/too fast. The tone of the voice and/or the deliverance makes the speech hard to follow. The speaker barely manages to establish his/her ethical position. The characterization of the speaker is conceived in a barely sufficient way and is often incoherent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-68</td>
<td>The speech is executed in a satisfactory manner. The tone of voice is sufficiently clear and the pace is adequate. The speaker somehow establishes her/his ethical position. Satisfactory characterization of the speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-80</td>
<td>The speech is overall well executed. The speaker mostly speaks off notes. The pace is overall good and establishes a good rhythm. The tone of voice/deliverance are good and help the speaker make her/his points. The speaker manages to establish her/his ethical position to a certain extent. The attempt is made to establish a relation of trust with the audience and to connect with the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>The speech is executed in a professional manner. It is well delivered, in terms of tone, pace and deliverance. The discourse successfully defines the character of the speaker and conveys a trustworthy and professional image. The speech successfully challenges the audience in order to arouse their trust and &quot;benevolence&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment of rhetorical figures</td>
<td>The speaker does not sufficiently structure his/her intervention. Basic analytical elements remain under identified or under explored. Presence of major logical pitfalls in the organization of the argument. The speaker does not provide data in support of his/her arguments. The speaker doesn’t attempt to establish an emotional relationship with the audience or the interlocutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to address questions from the ground</td>
<td>Dry, unfocused or insufficient answers to the questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation to the simulation</td>
<td>The speaker does not in the conference beyond his/her assigned speech.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | /20 points |
Additional Course Policies

Vesalius College Attendance Policy

As the College is committed to providing students with high-quality classes and ample opportunity for teacher-student interaction, it is imperative that students regularly attend class. As such, Vesalius College has a strict attendance policy. Participation in class meetings is mandatory, except in case of a medical emergency (e.g. sickness). Students will need to provide evidence for missing class (doctor’s note). If evidence is provided, the missed class is considered as an excused class. If no evidence is provided immediately before or after the class, the missed class is counted as an absence. Participation implies that students are on time: as a general rule, the College advises that students should be punctual in this regard, but it is up to the professor to decide whether to count late arrivals as absences, or not. If a student misses two classes in a row, his/her advisor will be notified.

Late paper policy

Because all deadlines are communicated to students beforehand, and because this is a master level course, it is students’ responsibility to make sure they are able to finish the assignments on time. Therefore, assignments that are not handed in on time are subject to the following penalties. The only exception to this can be a medical issue, proven by a doctor’s note. These penalties are deducted after calculating the overall grade of the assignment.

- 1 day late (0-24 hours): 10% reduction of original grade;
- 2 days late (24-48 hours): 20% reduction of original grade;
- 3 days late (48-72 hours): 30% reduction of original grade;
- 4 days late (72-96 hours): 40% reduction of original grade;
- 5 days late (96-120 hours): 50% reduction of original grade.
- After five days, the assignment is no longer accepted, resulting in an automatic grade of F.

Academic Honesty Statement

Academic dishonesty is NOT tolerated in this course. Academic honesty is not only an ethical issue but also the foundation of scholarship. Cheating and plagiarism (including self-plagiarism) are therefore serious breaches of academic integrity.

Following the College policy, cheating and plagiarism cases will be communicated in writing to the Associate Dean and submitted to the Student Conduct Committee for disciplinary action.
If you refer to someone else’s work, appropriate references and citations must be provided. Grammar, spelling and punctuation count, so use the tools necessary to correct before handing in assignments.

Please consult the Section “Avoiding Plagiarism” in the College Catalogue for further guidance.

**Turnitin**

All written assignments that graded and count for more than 10% towards the final course grade need to be submitted via the anti-plagiarism software Turnitin. You will receive from your professor a unique password and access code for your Class.

**Further academic Resources**


Eicher, PD (ed) *Emperor Dead: And Other Historic American Diplomatic Dispatches* (Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc.).

Elsworth, AT (2010, ed) *Electronic Warfare* (Nova Science Publisher).


Snyder, JT (2013) “What We are Talking about when We Talk about Engagement”. In: JT Snyder *The United States and the Challenge of Public Diplomacy* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan), pp. 27-61.


