PSC 700 – Democratic Representation and Accountability

Instructor

Simon Weschle   530 Eggers Hall
Assistant Professor of Political Science   swweschl@syr.edu
                                                                                 315.443.8678

Class Information

Day: Wednesday   Time: 9:30 - 12:15
Location: Eggers 341

Student Hours

Day: Monday   Time: 11:00 - 1:00
Location: Eggers 530 or Zoom (Meeting ID 967 4250 4513, Password 884019)

Course Description

In this seminar, we study the nuts and bolts of democracy. Its core characteristic are that policy is supposed to represent the preferences of citizens, and that the latter can throw the former out of office 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 representation and accountability in detail. In the second part, we focus on various factors that can interfere with (or enhance) representation and accountability.

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. The main focus is therefore 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. We will mostly read papers and books that came out in the last few years or that are still works in progress. Where available, I am providing citations to overview articles that summarize broader themes and historical developments within the different research areas. These are suggested readings that are not required for class, but highly recommended.

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 by email to me on **March 9**.

– *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) per email on **April 22**. The final proposal is due on **May 10**. 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 Opinion-ated 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 one of the last two sessions, 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. Immediately following the authors' presentation in one of the last two sessions of the class, 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://thepoliticalmeth odologist.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

Guide: ◆ Regular reading (mandatory), ★ Working paper (mandatory, peer review eligible), ▲ Professional development topic, → Overview reading (supplementary, but highly encouraged)

- *Jan 26 – 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: How to Write a Good Peer Review Report.

- *Feb 2 – Representation: Policy*

    ◆ Adams, James, Samuel Merrill III, and Roi Zur (2020): "The Spatial Voting Model." In: Luigi Curini and Robert Franzese (Eds): *The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations.* Sage.

    ★ Lupu, Noam and Zach Warner (2021): "Affluence and Congruence: Unequal Representation Around the World." Working Paper.

    ◆ O'Grady, Tom (2019): "Careerists Versus Coal-Miners: Welfare Reforms and the Substantive Representation of Social Groups in the British Labour Party." *Comparative Political Studies* 52(4): 544–578.

    ◆ 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.

    ◆ Holland, Alisha C. (2018): "Diminished Expectations: Redistributive Preferences in Truncated Welfare States." *World Politics* 70(4): 555–594.

    → Grossman, Guy and Tara Slough (2022): "Government Responsiveness in Developing Countries." *Annual Review of Political Science* 25: 5.1–5.23.

    → Erikson, Robert S. (2015): "Income Inequality and Policy Responsiveness." *Annual Review of Political Science* 18: 11–29.

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

→ 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.

- *Feb 9 – Representation: Distributive Politics*

  ◆ Cox, Gary W. (2012): "Swing Voters, Core Voters, and Distributive Politics." In: Ian Shapiro, Susan C. Stokes, Elizabeth Jean Wood, and Alexander S. Kirshner (Eds.): *Political Representation.* Cambridge University Press

  ◆ Harris, J. Andrew and Daniel N. Posner (2019): "(Under What Conditions) Do Politicians Reward Their Supporters? Evidence from Kenya's Constituencies Development Fund." *American Political Science Review* 113(1): 123–139.

  ◆ Thachil, Tariq (2014): *Elite Parties, Poor Voters: How Social Services Win Votes in India.* Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1 and 4.

  ◆ Wilfarth, Martha (2018): "Precolonial Legacies and Institutional Congruence in Public Goods Delivery: Evidence from Decentralized West Africa." *World Politics* 70(2): 239–274.

  ★ Spater, Jeremy and Erik Wibbels (2020): "Social Density, Clientelism, and Targeted Pork." Working Paper.

  → Golden, Miriam and Brian Min (2013): "Distributive Politics Around the World." *Annual Review of Political Science* 16: 73-99.

- *Feb 16 – Descriptive Representation: Gender*

  ★ Khan, Sarah (2021): "Count Me Out: Women's Unexpressed Preferences in Pakistan." Working Paper.

  ◆ Clayton, Amanda, Cecilia Josefsson, Robert Mattes, and Shaheen Mozaffar (2018): "In Whose Interest? Gender and Mass–Elite Priority Congruence in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Comparative Political Studies* 52(1): 69–101.

  ◆ O'Brien, Diana Z. (2015): "Rising to the Top: Gender, Political Performance, and Party Leadership in Parliamentary Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science* 59(4): 1022–1039..

  ◆ Clayton, Amanda, and Pär Zetterberg (2018): "Quota Shocks: Electoral Gender Quotas and Government Spending Priorities Worldwide." *Journal of Politics* 80(3): 916–932.

  ◆ Stauffer, Katelyn E. (2021): "Public Perceptions of Women's Inclusion and Feelings of Political Efficacy." *American Political Science Review* 115(4): 1226–1241.

  → Mansbridge, Jane (1999): "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes'." *Journal of Politics* 61(3): 628–657.

  → Lawless, Jennifer L. (2015): "Female Candidates and Legislators." *Annual Review of Political Science* 18: 349–366.

→ Clayton, Amanda (2021): "How Do Electoral Gender Quotas Affect Policy?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 24: 235–252.

- *Feb 23 – Descriptive Representation: Race and Ethnicity*

  ◆ Hayes, Matthew and Matthew W. Hibbing (2016): "The Symbolic Benefits of Descriptive and Substantive Representation." *Political Behavior* 39: 31–50.

  ◆ Ejdemyr, 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.

  ◆ Gulzar, Saad, Nicholas Haas, and Benjamin Pasquale (2020): "Does Political Affirmative Action Work, and for Whom? Theory and Evidence on India's Scheduled Areas." *American Political Science Review* 114(4): 1230–1246.

  ◆ Huber, John D. and Pavithra Suryanarayan (2016): "Ethnic Inequality and the Ethnification of Political Parties: Evidence from India." *World Politics* 68(1): 149–188.

  ★ Schakel, Wouter (2021): "The Two Worlds of Differential Representation: Identities and Resources in the Study of Political Inequality." Working Paper.

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

  → Griffin, John D. (2014): "When and Why Minority Legislators Matter." *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 327–336.

  → Sen, Maya and Omar Wasow (2016): "Race as a Bundle of Sticks: Designs that Estimate Effects of Seemingly Immutable Characteristics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 19: 499–522.

- *Mar 2 – Accountability: Voters*

  ◆ Croke, Kevin (2021): "The Impact of Health Programs on Political Opinion: Evidence from Malaria Control in Tanzania." *Journal of Politics* 83(1): 340–353.

  ◆ De Kadt, Daniel and Evan Lieberman (2017): "Nuanced Accountability: Voter Responses to Service Delivery in Southern Africa." *British Journal of Political Science* 50(1): 185–215.

  ◆ Weaver, Julie Anne (2021): "Electoral Dis-Connection: The Limits of Reelection in Contexts of Weak Accountability." *Journal of Politics* 83(4): 1462–1477.

  ◆ Hanretty, Chris, Jonathan Mellon, and Patrick English (2021): "Members of Parliament are Minimally Accountable for Their Issue Stances (and They Know It)." *American Political Science Review* 115(4): 1275–1291.

  ★ Shepherd, Michael (2021): "Dying for the Donald? The Politics of the Rural Hospital Crisis." Working Paper.

  → 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.

→ Margalit, Yotam (2019): "Political Responses to Economic Shocks." *Annual Review of Political Science* 22: 277-295.

▲ Professional Development: How to Respond to an R&R.

- *Mar 9 – Accountability: Politicians and Parties*

  ◆ Schwindt-Bayer, Leslie A. and Margit Tavits (2016): *Clarity of Responsibility, Accountability, and Corruption.* Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1, 2, 4.

  ◆ Ferraz, Claudio and Frederico Finan (2011): "Electoral Accountability and Corruption: Evidence from the Audits of Local Governments." *American Economic Review* 101: 1274–1311.

  ◆ Fouirnaies, Alexander and Andrew B. Hall (2021): "How Do Electoral Incentives Affect Legislator Behavior? Evidence from U.S. State Legislatures." *American Political Science Review* Online First.

  ◆ Motolinia, Lucia (2020): "Electoral Accountability and Particularistic Legislation: Evidence from an Electoral Reform in Mexico." *American Political Science Review* 115(1): 97–113.

  ★ Margalit, Yotam, Tara Slough, and Michael M. Ting (2021): "After Defeat: How Governing Parties Respond to Electoral Loss." Working Paper.

  → Ashworth, Scott (2012): "Electoral Accountability: Recent Theoretical and Empirical Work." *Annual Review of Political Science* 15: 183–201.

- *Mar 16 – No Class (Spring Break)*

- *Mar 23 – Political Selection*

  ◆ 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. Introduction, Ch. 1 and 4.

  ◆ Ichino, Nahomi and Noah L. Nathan (2021): "Democratizing the Party: The Effects of Primary Election Reforms in Ghana." *British Journal of Political Science* Online First.

  ★ Motolinia, Lucia, Marko Klašnja, and Simon Weschle (2022): "Campaign Finance Rules and Politicians' Wealth." Working Paper.

  ◆ Carreri, Maria (2021): "Can Good Politicians Compensate for Bad Institutions? Evidence from an Original Survey of Italian Mayors."

  → Gulzar, Saad (2021): "Who Enters Politics and Why?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 24: 263–275.

  → 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.

- *Mar 30 – Information and Media*

  - ◆ 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.

  - ◆ Pereira, Miguel M. (2021): "Understanding and Reducing Biases in Elite Beliefs About the Electorate." *American Political Science Review* 115(4): 1308–1324.

  - ◆ Soroka, Stuart N. and Christopher Wlezien (2022): *Information and Democracy: Public Policy in the News*. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1, 2, and 5.

  - ★ Grossman, Guy, Yotam Margalit, and Tamar Mitts (2021): "How the Ultra-Rich Use Media Ownership as a Political Investment." Working Paper.

  - → Prior, Markus (2013): "Media and Political Polarization" *Annual Review of Political Science* 16: 101–127.

  - → Jerit, Jennifer and Yangzi Zhao (2020): "Political Misinformation" *Annual Review of Political Science* 23: 77–94.

  - ▲ Professional Development: How to Write a Good Abstract and Introduction.

- *Apr 6 – Bureaucracy*

  - ◆ Neggers, Yusuf (2018): "Enfranchising Your Own? Experimental Evidence on Bureaucrat Diversity and Election Bias in India." *American Economic Review* 108(6): 1288-1321.

  - ★ Kim, Minju (2021): "How Bureaucrats Represent Economic Interests: Partisan Control over Trade Adjustment Assistance." Working Paper.

  - ◆ Pierskalla, Jan H., Adam Lauretig, Andrew S. Rosenberg, and Audrey Sacks (2021): "Democratization and Representative Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Promotion Patterns in Indonesia's Civil Service, 1980—2015." *American Journal of Political Science* 65(2): 261–277.

  - ◆ Brierley, Sarah (2020): "Combining Patronage and Merit in Public Sector Recruitment." *Journal of Politics* 83(1): 182–197.

  - ★ Suryanarayan, Pavithra (2021): "Status Politics Hollows Out the State: Evidence from Colonial India." Working Paper.

  - → Pepinsky, Thomas B., Jan H. Pierskalla, and Audrey Sacks (2017): "Bureaucracy and Service Delivery" *Annual Review of Political Science* 20: 249–268.

- *Apr 13 – Clientelism*

  - ◆ Nichter, Simeon (2019): *Votes for Survival. Relational Clientelism in Latin America.* Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1-3.

  - ◆ Gingerich, Daniel (2014): "Brokered Politics in Brazil: An Empirical Analysis." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 9(3): 269–300.

◆ Brierley, Sarah and Noah L. Nathan (2021): "The Connections of Party Brokers: Which Brokers do Parties Select?" *Journal of Politics* 83(3): 884–901.

★ Bullock, Jessie (2021): "Machine Gun Politics: Why Politicians Cooperate with Criminal Groups." Working Paper.

→ Hicken, Allen and Noah L. Nathan (2020): "Clientelism's Red Herrings: Dead Ends and New Directions in the Study of Nonprogrammatic Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 23: 277–294.

→ Hicken, Allen (2011): "Clientelism." *Annual Review of Political Science* 14:289-310.

▲ Professional Development: How to Give a Good Presentation.

- *Apr 20 – Fair Elections, Fraud, and Democratic Backsliding*

  ◆ Hyde, Susan D. (2020): "Democracy's Backsliding in the International Environment." *Science* 369(6508): 1192–1196.

  ◆ Rozenas, Arturas (2016): "Office Insecurity and Electoral Manipulation." *Journal of Politics* 78(1): 232–248.

  ◆ Ofosu, George Kwaku (2019): "Do Fairer Elections Increase the Responsiveness of Politicians?" *American Political Science Review* 113(4): 963–979.

  ★ Svolik, Milan (2021): "Voting Against Autocracy." Working Paper.

  ★ Grumbach, Jacob M. (2021): "Laboratories of Democratic Backsliding." Working Paper.

  → Mares, Isabela and Lauren Young (2016): "Buying, Expropriating, and Stealing Votes." *Annual Review of Political Science* 19: 267-288.

  ▲ Professional Development: How to Be a Good Discussant.

- *Apr 27 – Research Design Presentations*

- *May 4 – Research Design Presentations*

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AND FINE PRINT

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.

- Mental health and overall well-being are significant predictors of academic success. As such it is essential that during your college experience you develop the skills and resources effectively to navigate stress, anxiety, depression and other mental health concerns. Please familiarize yourself with the range of resources the Barnes Center provides (`ese.syr.edu/bewell`) and seek out support for mental health concerns as needed. Counseling services are available 24/7, 365 days a year, at 315.443.8000, and I encourage you to explore the resources available through the Wellness Leadership Institute, `https://ese.syr.edu/bewell/wellness-leadership-institute/`

- 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 (315-443-8000, Barnes Center at The Arch, 150 Sims Drive, Syracuse, New York 13244).

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, Syracuse, New York, 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, but as a professor I have mandatory reporting responsibilities to share information regarding sexual misconduct, harassment, and crimes I learn about with the University's Title IX Officer 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, please come to my office hours to talk about questions, difficulties with the class material or with homework, 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. As with all business-related correspondence, please include an appropriate salutation, identify yourself, and write in complete sentences. 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 (`http://supolicies.syr.edu/emp_ben/religious_observance.htm`) recognizes the diversity of faiths represented in the campus community and protects the rights of students, faculty, and staff to observe religious holy days according to their traditions. Under the policy, students are given 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 academic drop deadline. For observances occurring before the drop deadline, notification is required at least two academic days in advance. Students may enter their observances in MySlice under Student Services/Enrollment/My Religious Observances/Add a Notification.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Syracuse University values diversity and inclusion; we are committed to a climate of mutual respect and full participation. There may be aspects of the instruction or design of this course that result in barriers to your inclusion and full participation in this course. I invite any student to contact me to discuss strategies and/or accommodations (academic adjustments) that may be essential to your success and to collaborate with the Center for Disability Resources (CDR) in this process.

If you would like to discuss disability-accommodations or register with CDR, please visit Center for Disability Resources. Please call (315) 443-4498 or email disabilityresources@syr.edu for more detailed information.

The CDR is responsible for coordinating disability-related academic accommodations and will work with the student to develop an access plan. Since academic accommodations may require early planning and generally are not provided retroactively, please contact CDR as soon as possible to begin this process.

Academic Integrity

Syracuse University's Academic Integrity Policy reflects the high value that we, as a university commu-

nity, place on honesty in academic work. The policy holds students accountable for the integrity of all work they submit and for upholding course-specific, as well as university-wide, academic integrity expectations. The policy governs citation and use of sources, the integrity of work submitted in exams and assignments, and truthfulness in all academic matters, including course attendance and participation. The policy also prohibits students from: 1) submitting the same work in more than one class without receiving advance written authorization from both instructors and, 2) using websites that charge fees or require uploading of course materials to obtain exam solutions or assignments completed by others and present the work as their own. Under the policy, instructors who seek to penalize a student for a suspected violation must first report the violation to the Center for Learning and Student Success (CLASS). Students may not drop or withdraw from courses in which they face a suspected violation. Instructors must wait to assign a final course grade until a suspected violation is reviewed and upheld or overturned. Upholding Academic Integrity includes abiding by instructors' individual course expectations, which may include the protection of their intellectual property. Students should not upload, distribute, or otherwise share instructors' course materials without permission. Students found in violation of the policy 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. 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 Academic Integrity Policy can be accessed at `https://class.syr.edu/academic-integrity/policy/`.

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.

All academic integrity expectations that apply to in-person quizzes and exams also apply to online quizzes and exams. In this course, all work submitted for quizzes and exams must be yours alone. Discussing quiz or exam questions with anyone during the quiz or exam period violates academic integrity expectations for this course. Using websites that charge fees or require uploading of course material (e.g. Chegg, Course Hero) to obtain exam solutions or assignments completed by others and present the work as your own violates academic integrity expectations in this course.

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`.