

PSC 700 – Democratic Representation and Accountability

Syllabus: Spring 2020

Instructor

Simon Weschle
Assistant Professor of Political Science

530 Eggers Hall
swweschl@maxwell.syr.edu

Class Information

Wednesday

Time: 9:30-12:15

Classroom: Maxwell Hall 205A

Office Hours

Monday, 11:30-1:30, or by appointment (email me).

Course Description

In this seminar, we study the nuts and bolts of democracy. Its core characteristics are that policy is supposed to represent the preferences of citizens, and that the latter can hold the former accountable if they don't do a good job. How is this supposed to work, and what are factors that can impede democratic representation and accountability?

In the first part of the course, we study the different components of democracy: parties, candidates, elections, responsiveness, and accountability. In the second part, we discuss various factors that interfere with democratic representation and accountability. The main focus is not as much to provide you with a complete overview of the history of the study of the specific question, but instead to introduce you to work at the research frontier and to inspire you to conduct your own research. We will therefore mostly read papers and books that came out in the last few years or that are still works in progress. If you are interested in more detail, I am providing citations to overview articles that summarize broader themes and historical developments within the different research areas. These are recommended (but not required) readings that will prove useful if you want to delve more into a particular topic and/or study for comps.

The overarching goal of this class is to help you learn about cutting-edge research in the study of democracy, and to stimulate your own work. In addition, I want to help you develop professional skills that are integral to being a political scientist. We'll therefore devote some time to the following questions: How does one write a good abstract and paper introduction? How does one give a good presentation? How does one do a good job as a discussant? How does one write a peer review report? How does one respond to reviewers in a revise and resubmit?

Course Expectations and Requirements

- *Research Design Proposal and Presentation (50%)*: Over the course of the semester, you will develop a research design on a topic broadly related to the topic of the course. This consists of multiple parts:
 - *Discussion and Set-Up*: The first step in a research project is to identify a research topic and to motivate it. For example, it could be that you observe a gap or inconsistency in the literature; that existing scholarship predicts empirical patterns at odds with reality; or that the literature makes predictions about a certain phenomenon that contradict each other. The choice of a research topic requires considerable thought and effort. In particular, you need to (1) establish the unexplained empirical pattern that your research will address, and (2) master the literature to which you seek to contribute and demonstrate that it does not

explain the empirical puzzle you have identified. In the first part of your paper, you will accomplish these two things. The paper is due in class on **March 11**.

- *Argument and Empirical Strategy*: Identifying an empirical phenomenon and showing that the literature does not adequately explain it is the first (necessary but not sufficient) step of a research project. In a second step, you then need to craft a strategy to provide an answer to the puzzle, both theoretically and empirically.

In the second part of the research design paper, you will lay out your theoretical argument and link it to a proposed empirical strategy that can test the observable implications of your theory. Be as specific as possible: What are the hypotheses that link your argument to the empirical data? What data will you use? Which is the variable you seek to explain? Which is/are the variable(s) that do the explaining? What are potential confounding factors, and how will you seek to control for their influence? What are the advantages of your empirical strategy, and what are its weaknesses and limitations? Note that you do not actually have to assemble the data and do the analyses. But you should be realistic about the kind of research design you are proposing – it should be something that you could do in the future.

A draft of the final proposal (containing the potentially revised discussion and set-up as well as the argument and empirical strategy) is due to your peer reviewer (and me) on **April 15**. The final proposal is due on **May 6**. As guidance/inspiration, have a look at the database of pre-registered research designs: <http://egap.org/design-registrations>. Note that you are free to develop a research project using any kind of methodology. You are encouraged to discuss your proposal with me in office hours.

One of the most important things for an academic career is good (or at least not terrible) writing. If you are unable to convey your point in a clear and concise manner, it is unlikely that many people will care to read your work, no matter how insightful it is. For some advice about how to write academic papers, have a look at some of the resources listed here: <http://fhollenbach.org/WritingAcademic>. In addition, I recommend the following:

- * Stimson, James A. (2006): “Professional Writing in Political Science: A Highly Opinionated Essay.” <http://stimson.web.unc.edu/files/2018/02/Writing.pdf>
- * Munger, Michael C. (2010): “10 Tips on How to Write Less Badly.” <http://www.chronicle.com/article/10-Tips-on-How-to-Write-Less/124268>

You might also want to consult the following excellent book:

- * Sword, Helen (2012): *Stylish Academic Writing*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press. To see how your writing holds up, evaluate a page or two using the following tool: <http://writersdiet.com/test.php>.

- *Presentation*: In the last session, you will give a conference-style 10-12 minute presentation of your research design to the class.

- *Discussant & Peer Reviewer (10%)*: You will be assigned to serve as a peer reviewer and discussant for one of your classmates’ research proposal. They will send you a draft of their proposal a week before the presentation. In the last session of the course, immediately following the authors’ presentation, you will provide a 5 minute discussion of their project. In addition, you will write a peer review report on their proposal.

- *2 Peer Reviews of Working Papers (20%)*: Because we will discuss work at the research frontier, a good number of the assigned readings are working papers currently going through or about to go through the peer review process. These are marked with a * below. You will write peer review reports for two of them (your choice which one's). The peer reviews are due by **noon the day before they are discussed in class**.

We'll talk in more detail about how to write a good review in the first session, but in general the goal is not to simply summarize the paper, but to provide a critical evaluation of its merits and shortcomings, and to provide an informed recommendation as to whether it should be published or not; or what changes need to be made before it's publishable. For a good introductions, see the following:

- Miller, Beth, Jon Pevehouse, Ron Rogowski, Dustin Tingley, and Rick Wilson (2013): "How To Be a Peer Reviewer: A Guide for Recent and Soon-to-be PhDs." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 46(1): 120-123.
 - Special Issue on Peer Review in *The Political Methodologist*: https://thepoliticalmethodologist.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/tpm_v23_n1.pdf. See in particular the articles by Nyhan, Pepinsky, and Mitchell.
- *Class Participation (20%)*: The quality of the seminar depends heavily on student participation. There will be some parts where I will lecture, but most of the class will be conducted seminar-style, that is heavily discussion-based. You are therefore expected to come to class having completed *all* the required readings and be prepared to talk about them. To ensure this, please send me half a page or so of questions and discussion points related to the week's readings by **noon the day before class**. For example, you can raise questions about the papers' theory, research designs, the connection between the two, connections or conflicts between different readings or readings from prior weeks, and so on. You can also raise specific questions about things you did not understand. The comments can focus on all papers, a few, or just one. I will compile the questions/comments and send them to everyone.

For your final grade, I use the following scale as a guide: A (93-100), A- (90-92), B+ (87-89), B (83-86), B- (80-82), C+ (77-79), C (73-76), C- (70-72), F (0-69). There are no D grades in graduate courses.

Course Schedule and Assigned Readings

• **Jan 15 – Introduction: Representation and Accountability**

- ◆ Manin, Bernard, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes (1999): “Introduction.” In: Manin, Bernard, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes (Eds): *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge University Press.
- ◆ Manin, Bernard, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes (1999): “Elections and Representation.” In: Manin, Bernard, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes (Eds): *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge University Press.
- ◆ Fearon, James D. (1999): “Electoral Accountability and the Control of Politicians: Selecting Good Types versus Sanctioning Poor Performance.” In: Manin, Bernard, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes (Eds): *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge University Press.
- ◆ Mansbridge, Jane (2003): “Rethinking Representation.” *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 515-528.

⇒ *Professional Development Topic: How to Write a Peer Review Report.*

• **Jan 22 – Policy**

- ◆ Downs, Anthony (1957): *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper & Row. Ch. 3, 7, 8.
- ◆ Stokes, Susan C. (1999): “What Do Policy Switches Tell Us about Democracy?” In: Manin, Bernard, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes (Eds): *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge University Press.
- ◆ Somer-Topcu, Zeynep (2015): “Everything to Everyone: The Electoral Consequences of the Broad-Appeal Strategy in Europe.” *American Journal of Political Science* 59(4): 841-854.
- ◆ Adams, James, Lawrence Ezrow and Zeynep Somer-Topcu (2011): “Is Anybody Listening? Evidence that Voters do not Respond to European Parties’ Policy Programmes.” *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2): 370-382.
- ◆ *Lee, Seonghui, Philip Santoso, and Randolph Stevenson (2019): “The Nature and Sources of Voters’ Beliefs about the Left-Right Positions of Political Parties.” *Working Paper*.

⇒ *Background Reading (voluntary):*

- Laver, Michael (2014): “Measuring Policy Positions in Political Space.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 207-223.
- Adams, James (2012): “Causes and Electoral Consequences of Party Policy Shifts in Multiparty Elections: Theoretical Results and Empirical Evidence.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 15: 401-419.

• **Jan 29 – Accountability and Retrospective Voting**

- ◆ Duch, Raymond M. and Randolph T. Stevenson (2008): *The Economic Vote: How Political and Economic Institutions Condition Election Results*. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1-3.
- ◆ Ferraz, Claudio and Frederico Finan (2011): “Electoral Accountability and Corruption: Evidence from the Audits of Local Governments.” *American Economic Review* 101: 1274-1311.
- ◆ Schwindt-Bayer, Leslie A. and Margit Tavits (2016): *Clarity of Responsibility, Accountability, and Corruption*. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1, 2, 4.
- ◆ Dunning, Thad et al. (2019): “Voter Information Campaigns and Political Accountability: Cumulative Findings from a Pre-Registered Meta-Analysis of Coordinated Trials.” *Science Advances* 5(7): eaaw2612.
- ◆ *Martin, Lucy, and Pia Raffler (2019): “Fault Lines: The Effects of Bureaucratic Power on Electoral Accountability.” Working Paper.

⇒ *Background Reading (voluntary):*

- Healy, Andrew and Neil Malholtra (2013): “Retrospective Voting Reconsidered.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 16: 285-306.
- de Vries, Catherine E. and Hector Solaz. 2017. “The Electoral Consequences of Corruption.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 20: 391-408.
- Ashworth, Scott (2012): “Electoral Accountability: Recent Theoretical and Empirical Work.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 15: 183-201.

• **Feb 5 – Demographics and Identity**

- ◆ Chattopadhyay, Raghendra and Esther Duflo (2004): “Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a Randomized Policy Experiment in India.” *Econometrica*, 72(5): 1409-1443.
- ◆ O’Brien, Diana Z. and Johanna Rickne (2016): “Gender Quotas and Women’s Political Leadership.” *American Political Science Review*: 110(1): 112-126.
- ◆ Ejdeymyr, Simon, Eric Kramon, and Amanda Lea Robinson (2017): “Segregation, Ethnic Favoritism, and the Strategic Targeting of Local Public Goods.” *Comparative Political Studies* 51(9): 1111-1143.
- ◆ Stegmueller, Daniel (2013): “Religion and Redistributive Voting in Western Europe.” *Journal of Politics* 75(4): 1064-1076.
- ◆ *Cryer, Jennifer, E. (2019): “Navigating Identity in Campaign Messaging: The Influence of Race & Gender on Strategy in U.S. Congressional Elections.” Working Paper.

⇒ *Background Reading (voluntary):*

- Kalin, Michael and Nicholas Sambanis (2018): “How to Think About Social Identity.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 21: 239-257.

- Lawless, Jennifer L. (2015): “Female Candidates and Legislators.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 18:349-366.
- Griffin, John D. (2014): “When and Why Minority Legislators Matter.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 17:327-336.

• **Feb 12 – Political Parties and Electoral Competition**

- ◆ Adams, James F., Samuel Merrill III, and Bernard Grofman (2005): *A Unified Theory of Party Competition. A Cross-National Analysis Integrating Spatial and Behavioral Factors*. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1-4.
- ◆ Fortunato, David (2019): “Legislative Review and Party Differentiation in Coalition Governments.” *American Political Science Review* 113(1): 242-247.
- ◆ Martin, Lanny W. and Georg Vanberg (Forthcoming): “Coalition Government, Legislative Institutions, and Public Policy in Parliamentary Democracies.” *American Journal of Political Science*. First View.
- ◆ Abou-Chadi, Tarik, and Werner Krause (Forthcoming): “The Causal Effect of Radical Right Success on Mainstream Parties’ Policy Positions: A Regression Discontinuity Approach.” *British Journal of Political Science*. First View.
- ◆ *Pereira, Miguel Maria (2019): “Understanding and Reducing Biases in Elite Beliefs About the Electorate.” *Working Paper*.

• **Feb 19 – Selection into Politics**

- ◆ Besley, Timothy (2005): “Political Selection.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19(3): 43-60.
- ◆ Hall, Andrew B. (2019): *Who Wants to Run? How the Devaluing of Political Office Drives Polarization*. University of Chicago Press.
- ◆ Dal Bó, Ernesto, Frederico Finan, Olle Folke, Torsten Persson, and Johanna Rickne (2017): “Who Becomes a Politician?” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 132(4): 1877-1914.
- ◆ *Gulzar, Saad, Zuhad Hai, and Binod Kumar Paudel (2019): “Information, Candidate Selection, and the Quality of Representation: Evidence from Nepal.” *Working Paper*.

⇒ *Professional Development Topic: How to Be a Discussant.*

⇒ *Background Reading (voluntary):*

- Dal Bó, Ernesto and Frederico Finan. (2015): “Progress and Perspectives in the Study of Political Selection.” *Annual Review of Economics* 10:541-575.

• **Feb 26 – Public Opinion and Policy Congruence/Responsiveness**

- ◆ Hobolt, Sara Binzer and Robert Klemmensen (2008): “Government Responsiveness and Political Competition in Comparative Perspective.” *Comparative Political Studies* 41(3): 309-337.

- ◆ Lax, Jeffrey R. and Justin H. Phillips (2012): “The Democratic Deficit in the States.” *American Journal of Political Science* 56(1): 148-166.
- ◆ Leemann, Lucas and Fabian Wasserfallen (2016): “The Democratic Effect of Direct Democracy.” *American Political Science Review* 110(4): 750-762.
- ◆ *Thompson, Daniel M. (2019): “Do Elections Increase Local Policy Responsiveness? Evidence from Elected Police Commissioners.” Working Paper.
- ◆ *Foos, Florian and Daniel Bischof (2019): “Tabloid Media Influence on Euroscepticism: Quasi-Experimental Evidence from England.” Working Paper.

⇒ *Background Reading (voluntary):*

- Canes-Wrone, Brandice (2015): “From Mass Preferences to Policy.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 18:147-165.

• **Mar 4 – Electoral Systems**

- ◆ Golder, Matt and Jacek Stramski (2010): “Ideological Congruence and Electoral Institutions.” *American Journal of Political Science* 54(1): 90-106.
- ◆ Carey, John M. and Simon Hix (2011): “The Electoral Sweet Spot: Low-Magnitude Proportional Electoral Systems.” *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2): 383-397.
- ◆ Becher, Michael and Irene Menéndez González (2019): “Electoral Reform and Trade-Offs in Representation.” *American Political Science Review* 113(3): 694-709.
- ◆ Leemann, Lucas and Isabela Mares (2014): “The Adoption of Proportional Representation.” *Journal of Politics* 76(2): 461-478.
- ◆ *Eubanks, Nicholas and Jonathan Rodden (2019): “Who is my Neighbor? The Spatial Efficiency of Partisanship.” Working Paper.

⇒ *Professional Development Topic: How to Write a Good Abstract and Introduction.*

⇒ *Background Reading (voluntary):*

- Grofman, Bernard (2016): “Perspectives on the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 19: 523-540.
- Ferree, Karen E., G. Bingham Powell and Ethan Scheiner (2014): “Context, Electoral Rules, and Party Systems.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 17:421-439.

• **Mar 11 – Electoral Fraud and Voter Repression**

- ◆ Mares, Isabela (2015): *From Open Secrets to Secret Voting. Democratic Electoral Reforms and Voter Autonomy.* Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1, 2, 6, 7.

- ◆ Rozenas, Arturas (2016): “Office Insecurity and Electoral Manipulation.” *Journal of Politics* 78(1): 232-248.
- ◆ Gingerich, Daniel (2019): “Ballot Reform as Suffrage Restriction: Evidence from Brazil’s Second Republic.” *American Journal of Political Science* 63(4): 920-935.
- ◆ Neggers, Yusuf (2018): “Enfranchising Your Own? Experimental Evidence on Bureaucrat Diversity and Election Bias in India.” *American Economic Review* 108(6): 1288-1321.
- ◆ *Chen, M. Keith, Devin G. Pope, Kareem Haggag, and Ryne Rohla (2019): “Racial Disparities in Voting Wait Times: Evidence from Smartphone Data.” Working Paper.

- **Mar 18 – No Class (Spring Break)**

- **Mar 25 – Unequal Participation**

- ◆ Kogan, Vladimir, Stéphane Lavertu, and Zachary Peskowitz (2018): “Election Timing, Electorate Composition, and Policy Outcomes: Evidence from School Districts.” *American Journal of Political Science* 62(3): 637-651.
- ◆ White, Ariel (2019): “Misdemeanor Disenfranchisement? The Demobilizing Effects of Brief Jail Spells on Potential Voters.” *American Political Science Review* 113(2): 311-324.
- ◆ *Clinton, Joshua, Nick Eubank, Adriane Fresh, and Michael E. Shepherd (2019): “Polling Place Changes and Political Participation: Evidence from North Carolina Presidential Elections, 2008-2016.” Working Paper.
- ◆ *Prillaman, Soledad Artiz (2018): “Strength in Numbers: How Women’s Groups Close India’s Political Gender Gap.” Working Paper.
- ◆ *de Kadt, Daniel (2019): “Bringing the Polls to the People: How Electoral Access Encourages Turnout but Shapes Political Inequality.” Working Paper.

⇒ *Background Reading (voluntary):*

- Cox, Gary W. (2015): “Electoral Rules, Mobilization, and Turnout.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 18: 49-68.

- **Apr 1 – Special Interest Politics**

- ◆ Bombardini, Matilde, and Francesco Trebbi (2019): “Empirical Models of Lobbying.” Working Paper.
- ◆ Querubin, Pablo and James M. Snyder, Jr. (2013): “The Control of Politicians in Normal Times and Times of Crisis: Wealth Accumulation by U.S. Congressmen, 1850-1880.” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 8(4):409-450.
- ◆ *Avis, Eric, Claudio Ferraz, Frederico Finan, and Carlos Varjão (2019): “Money and Politics: The Effects of Campaign Spending Limits on Political Entry and Competition.” Working Paper.

- ◆ *Kaplan, Ethan, Jörg Spenkuch, and Haishan Yuan (2019): “Moral Hazard and Special Interests in Congress.” Working Paper.
- ◆ Weschle, Simon (2019): “The Impact of Parliamentary Positions on Politicians’ Private Sector Earnings: Evidence from the UK House of Commons.” Working Paper.

⇒ *Professional Development Topic: How to Respond to an R&R.*

⇒ *Background Reading (voluntary):*

- Dawood, Yasmin (2015): “Campaign Finance and American Democracy.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 18: 329-348.
- de Figueiredo, John M. and Brian Kelleher Richter (2014): “Advancing the Empirical Research on Lobbying.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 17:163-185.

● **Apr 8 – Targeted Distribution**

- ◆ Thachil, Tariq (2014): *Elite Parties, Poor Voters: How Social Services Win Votes in India*. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1, 4, 5.
- ◆ Nichter, Simeon (2019): *Votes for Survival. Relational Clientelism in Latin America*. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1-3.
- ◆ *Brierley, Sarah and Noah L. Nathan (2019): “The Connections of Party Brokers.” Working Paper.
- ◆ *Spater, Jeremy and Erik Wibbels (2019): “Social Density, Clientelism and Vote Banking.” Working Paper.

⇒ *Professional Development Topic: How to Give a Good Presentation.*

⇒ *Background Reading (voluntary):*

- Hicken, Allen and Noah L. Nathan (forthcoming): “Clientelism’s Red Herrings: Dead Ends and New Directions in the Study of Non-Programmatic Politics.” *Annual Review of Political Science*.
- Mares, Isabela and Lauren Young (2016): “Buying, Expropriating, and Stealing Votes.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 19: 267-288.
- Golden, Miriam and Brian Min (2013): “Distributive Politics Around the World.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 16: 73-99.
- Hicken, Allen (2011): “Clientelism.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 14:289-310.

● **Apr 15 – Economic Inequality**

- ◆ Markus, Stanislav and Volha Charnysh (2017): “The Flexible Few: Oligarchs and Wealth Defense in Developing Democracies.” *Comparative Political Studies* 50(12): 1632-1665.

- ◆ Gilens, Martin and Benjamin I. Page (2014): “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens.” *Perspectives on Politics* 12(3): 564-581.
- ◆ Enns, Peter K. (2015): “Relative Policy Support and Coincidental Representation.” *Perspectives on Politics* 13(4): 1053-1064. Read after Gilens/Page.
- ◆ Bashir, Omar S. (2015): “Testing Inferences about American Politics: A Review of the ‘Oligarchy’ Result.” *Research and Politics* 2(4): 1-7. Read after Gilens/Page.
- ◆ Branham, J. Alexander, Stuart N. Soroka, and Christopher Wlezien (2017): “When Do the Rich Win?” *Political Science Quarterly* 132(1): 43-62. Read after Gilens/Page.
- ◆ *Feigenbaum, James, Alexander Hertel-Fernandez, Vanessa Williamson (2019): “From the Bargaining Table to the Ballot Box: Political Effects of Right to Work Laws.” Working Paper.

⇒ *Background Reading (voluntary):*

- Erikson, Robert S. (2015): “Income Inequality and Policy Responsiveness.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 18: 11-29.
- Scheve, Kenneth and David Stasavage (2017): “Wealth Inequality and Democracy.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 20: 451-468.
- Ahlquist, John S. (2017): “Labor Unions, Political Representation, and Economic Inequality.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 20: 409-432.

- **Apr 22 – Research Design Presentations – Start at 9am**

Campus Resources

As an SU student you have access to a variety of resources that can help you in this class and beyond. Please make use of them.

- Counseling Center: <http://counselingcenter.syr.edu/faculty-staff/helping-students-in-distress.html> and http://counselingcenter.syr.edu/_documents/Bill_of_Rights.pdf.
- Writing Center: http://wc.syr.edu/?_ga=2.101027140.454082058.1534346263-1387513330.1433439063
- Tutoring Services: CenterforLearningandStudentSuccess:<http://class.syr.edu/tutoring>
- Financial Counseling: <http://financialaid.syr.edu/financialliteracy>
- Career Services: http://thecollege.syr.edu/advising/index.html?_ga=2.101048900.454082058.1534346263-1387513330.1433439063
- Sexual Harassment/Title IX Concerns: Sheila Johnson-Willis, Compliance Officer. titleix@syr.edu. 315.443.0211
- Sexual & Relationship Violence Response Team: 315.443.4715

Harassment, Confidentiality, and Mandatory Reporting

Federal and state law, and University policy prohibit discrimination and harassment based on sex or gender (including sexual harassment, sexual assault, domestic/dating violence, stalking, sexual exploitation, and retaliation). If a student has been harassed or assaulted, they can obtain confidential counseling support, 24-hours a day, 7 days a week, from the Sexual and Relationship Violence Response Team at the Counseling Center (315.443.4715, 200 Walnut Place, http://counselingcenter.syr.edu/_documents/Bill_of_Rights.pdf).

Incidents of sexual violence or harassment can be reported non-confidentially to the University's Title IX Officer (Sheila Johnson Willis, 315.443.0211, titleix@syr.edu, 005 Steele Hall). Reports to law enforcement can be made to the University's Department of Public Safety (315.443.2224, 005 Sims Hall), the Syracuse Police Department (511 South State Street, 911 in case of emergency or 315.435.3016 to speak with the Abused Persons Unit), or the State Police (844.845.7269).

I will seek to keep information you share with me private to the greatest extent possible. It is my goal that you feel able to share information related to your life experiences in classroom discussions, in your written work, and in our one-on-one meetings. However, as a professor I have mandatory reporting responsibilities to share information regarding sexual misconduct, harassment, and crimes I learn about to help make our campus a safer place for all.

Communication

If you have questions about the material, chances are that you are not the only one. Therefore the best way to ask questions is in class. If your question is not related to class material or relevant to other students, feel free to approach me after class. I also encourage you to visit my office hours to talk about

questions, difficulties with the class material or with assignments, and so on. If you cannot make office hours, feel free to send me an email to set up an appointment.

I will usually respond to email within 24 hours during the week. I will not respond to emails during weekends, except for urgent matters. Students are expected to check their email accounts regularly, as I will be using email to provide announcements and updates about the course. See Syracuse's email policy at <http://supolicies.syr.edu/it/email.htm>.

Religious Observances

SU's religious observances policy, at http://supolicies.syr.edu/emp_ben/religious_observance.htm, is intended to recognize the diversity of faiths represented among the campus community and protect the rights of students (as well as faculty and staff) to observe religious holy days according to their tradition. Under the policy, students are provided an opportunity to make up any examination, study, or work requirements that may be missed due to a religious observance - provided they notify their instructors no later than the end of the second week of classes.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

I am committed to supporting Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. This means that in general no individual who is otherwise qualified shall be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity, solely by reason of having a disability.

If you believe that you need accommodations for a disability, please contact the Office of Disability Services (ODS) located at 804 University Avenue, third floor or go to the ODS website at <http://disabilityservices.syr.edu> and click current students tab to register on-line. You may also call 315.443.4498 to speak to someone regarding specific access needs. ODS is responsible for coordinating disability-related accommodations and will issue 'Accommodation Letters' to students as appropriate. Since accommodations may require early planning and are not provided retroactively, please contact ODS as soon as possible.

Academic Integrity

Syracuse University's Academic Integrity Policy reflects the high value that we, as a university community, place on honesty in academic work. The policy defines our expectations for academic honesty and holds students accountable for the integrity of all work they submit. Students should understand that it is their responsibility to learn about course-specific expectations, as well as about university-wide academic integrity expectations. The policy governs appropriate citation and use of sources, the integrity of work submitted in exams and assignments, and the veracity of signatures on attendance sheets and other verification of participation in class activities. The policy also prohibits students from submitting the same work in more than one class without receiving written authorization in advance from both instructors. Under the policy, students found in violation are subject to grade sanctions determined by the course instructor and non-grade sanctions determined by the School or College where the course is offered as described in the Violation and Sanction Classification Rubric. SU students are required to read an online summary of the University's academic integrity expectations and provide an electronic signature agreeing to abide by them twice a year during pre-term check-in on MySlice. The Violation and Sanction Classification Rubric establishes recommended guidelines for the determination of grade penalties by faculty and instructors, while also giving them discretion to select the grade penalty they

believe most suitable, including course failure, regardless of violation level. Any established violation in this course may result in course failure regardless of violation level. For more information and the complete policy, see <http://class.syr.edu/academic-integrity/policy>.

Privacy and Student Records

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) sets forth requirements regarding the privacy of student records. FERPA governs both the access to and release of those records, known as education records, and the information they contain. Under FERPA, faculty have a legal responsibility to protect the confidentiality of student records. For additional information about FERPA and SU's FERPA policy, see: <http://www.syr.edu/registrar/staff/ferpa>.