

POLS 3620: INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

INSTRUCTOR: Dr. N. Uras Demir (Call me Uras)

E-MAIL: uras.demir@lmu.edu

CLASS LOCATION/HOUR: FAN 180 / MW 1:45 PM – 3:25 PM

OFFICE HOURS: 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM @ [Zoom](#) / UNH4203

COURSE DESCRIPTION (WHAT IS THIS COURSE ABOUT?)

How can we make sense of war, peace, and global security in an increasingly complex world? This course introduces the central ideas, theories, and debates defining international security today. We will explore why wars start, how peace endures, and the strategic interactions that shape global politics, including deterrence, alliances, nuclear strategy, terrorism, and emerging threats such as cyber conflict and environmental crises. We will go over foundational texts, cutting-edge research, simulations, and detailed case studies; you will actively engage with the critical questions confronting scholars, policymakers, and security practitioners worldwide.

COURSE OBJECTIVES (WHAT WILL I GET OUT OF THIS COURSE?)

This course equips you with a deep conceptual understanding of international security, focusing on your analytical thinking and communication abilities. By semester's end, you will:

- Explain and critically evaluate the major theories and frameworks related to war, peace, and global security.
- Recognize, analyze, and assess diverse security threats, their origins, evolution, and wider implications.
- Apply theoretical concepts to historical and contemporary scenarios involving conflict, alliances, crisis management, and peacebuilding efforts.

Beyond subject-specific knowledge, you will develop key transferable skills, including critical analysis, persuasive argumentation, and effective written and verbal communication. These competencies are highly sought after in government, international organizations, think tanks, academia, and private-sector roles in security and policy analysis. Whether your goals include a career in public service, research, consulting, or international affairs, the analytical tools and practical insights gained here will provide lasting value both academically and professionally.

COURSE MATERIALS:

<i>Textbook</i>	Hough, P., Pilbeam B., & Stokes, W. (2021). International security studies: Theory and practice (2nd ed.). Routledge. New~\$30 on Amazon . You should also check out the library! We will also have readings from different sources that you will be able to access abridged online through the course space or elsewhere. We will also use Oxford Bibliographies .
<i>Slides</i>	All slides will be posted on the course space.
<i>Ed-tech</i>	We will also use third-party applications, like, Kahoot and polleverywhere, in the course.

COURSE COMMUNICATION:

Course materials and updates will be posted on the online course space. Turn on course notifications and check your email account regularly.

EMAIL POLICY

Send emails regarding the course to uras.demir@lmu.edu. Emails should be sent from your lmu.edu email and include the course name (POLS3620) in the subject line. Resend your email if you don't receive a reply within 48 hours.

ASSESSMENTS & GRADES

ASSESSMENTS	DESCRIPTION	GRADE PERCENTAGE	DUE
ATTENDANCE & PARTICIPATION	Required. You can miss 3 days out of the twenty-eight days that we are meeting—no questions asked. Beyond that, you lose 2 points off for each day missed, <i>except for an excusable circumstance (requires documentation)</i> .	15%	Each week
WEEKLY REVIEW QUIZZES	You will have 13 weekly review quizzes on the course space starting Week 2. <i>They are due Tuesday 11:59 pm of each week.</i> Lowest 3 will be dropped.	10%	Each week
MIDTERM	No midterm exam	-	-
INFOGRAPHIC + PRESENTATION	One infographic. Individual assignment. We will have a session where you will present your work. See below for more information.	15%	Week 4 Infographic poster presentations on Monday and Wednesday
SECURITY MEMO + PRESENTATION	One memo. Group project (2 students) addressing a security issue. See below for more information.	20%	Week 8
RESEARCH PROJECT + PRESENTATION	One research paper. See below for more information.	40%	Week 6 + Week 12 + Week 15 + Finals week
EXTRA CREDIT	Fill out both the midterm and final instructor evaluations.	TBD%	TBD
FINAL	No final exam	-	-

THE GRADING SCALE

A	100-95%	C	69-65%
A-	94-90%	C-	64-60%
B+	89-85%	D+	59-55%
B	84-80%	D	54-50%
B-	79-75%	D-	49 -45%
C+	74-70%	F	44% and below

LATE POLICY

1 % off from the assignment for each late day. *Except for an excusable circumstance (requires documentation)*.

Not happy with your grade? Formal grade appeals must be made via email within two days after the grade was posted. If you request a grade review, I will regrade your entire assignment. Therefore, understand that your grade may go up or down following regrading.

ASSIGNMENT BREAKDOWN

1) INFOGRAPHIC (INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENT) – DUE WEEK 4

Visually communicate a complex security issue to a general audience clearly and effectively around 500 words.

Pick Your Topic

Choose a specific international security issue (e.g., nuclear proliferation, cyberattacks on critical infrastructure, food security in conflict zones). Avoid topics that are too broad.

Integrate IR Theory

Early in your research, select one IR theory to guide your explanation. Outline the theory's core expectations for the issue. Your infographic must contrast theory expectations with observed reality—this is the heart of the analysis.

Research & Source Data

Focus on the 2-4 most important points you want your audience to remember.

Collect key facts, data, and **make your visuals** (charts, graphs, maps) do not copy/screenshot. This should be done through Excel or PowerPoint! We will go over a list of potential data sources.

Design Principles

Prioritize clarity. The infographic should be 1 single document.

Use minimal text—let visuals and numbers do the work.

Organize information with headings, flowcharts, or timelines for easy reading.

The output should look engaging—this is where your imagination and aesthetic preferences matter!

I highly recommend that you use [Canva \(free version\)](#) for this assignment.

Citations

Separate APA-formatted reference list (submitted as Word or PDF).

Discreet in-text cues in the infographic (e.g., “UNDP, 2023”).

Submission

Submit as a PDF before class Week 4.

Presentation (TBD)

In class, poster presentation style during Week 4's Monday and Wednesday sessions.

Be ready to present your infographic in class (~3 minutes).

Why you chose your topic

The findings through the visuals

The “takeaway” you want viewers to leave with

Submit as a PDF.

2) SECURITY MEMO (GROUP ASSIGNMENT, 2 STUDENTS) – PAPER SUBMISSION DUE WEEK 8, PRESENTATION DUE MONDAY WEEK 9

This memo simulates the kind of advice senior officials receive—clear, analytic, and actionable. Here are two real examples: (1) [Memorandum for the President on Israeli Nuclear Program](#), (2) [Memorandum for the President on Policy Options Toward Pakistan](#). The final deliverable should be ~4-5 double spaced pages long the following structure:

The Situation:

What is the security challenge? Why is it urgent or significant now?

Concisely describe the immediate situation (1–2 paragraphs): who, what, where, when.

State what has brought this issue to a head—recent developments, triggering events, escalation, or new risks.

The Interest of the State:

Why does this issue matter to your state? What are the core national interests involved?

Identify and briefly explain 2–3 specific national interests at stake (security, economic, alliances, credibility, legal/normative). Connect these interests to the situation—be concrete.

Broader Context:

Who else is involved? What are the interests and likely positions of other key countries, organizations, or actors?

Identify the main international actors or stakeholders (other states, international organizations, non-state actors).

Briefly explain each actor's likely interests, objectives, and role in the situation. Map out areas of alignment, conflict, or uncertainty among these parties. Consider power dynamics, alliances, rivalries, and relevant historical context.

The Options:

What are the plausible policy options? What are their costs and risks?

Lay out three distinct and realistic policy options for your state.

For each option, include:

Main actions/steps

Pros (opportunities, benefits), Cons (risks, costs, possible backlash).

Present options as bullets or a simple table for clarity, then explain in full sentences.

Ensure all options are plausible and have real-world precedents where possible.

The Recommendations:

What do you advise, and why?

State your recommended option (or combination) clearly and succinctly.

Summarize the main actions to be taken.

List 2–3 supporting points (why this option is best, how it balances risks/interests, etc.).

Recommendations must be specific, actionable, and realistic.

The Rationale:

Explain your reasoning and address objections.

Provide a deeper justification for your recommendation.

Anticipate at least one counterargument or alternative and explain why your approach is superior.

Reference (1) relevant IR theory, and (2) provide brief history, or a case as appropriate.

Formatting & Style:

Length should be 3–4 double-spaced pages (excluding and references). Use all section headings above. Analytical, direct, and professional; no unnecessary narrative. Cite all facts and claims (APA).

SUBMISSION AND IN CLASS PRESENTATION

Submit your memo Week 8 Sunday 11:59 PM.

Monday Week 9 – 5 minute presentation explaining the situation, theoretical expectation, and your recommendation in 3-5 slides.

3) THE RESEARCH PROJECT – PARTS DUE WEEKS 6, 12, 15 AND FINALS WEEK

One quarter of your final grade is based on this research project. You will conduct an in-depth case study analysis applying concepts from our international security course. The project involves three main components. **You cannot finish this assignment overnight!**

Research Project Part 1 – Length: Approximately 4–5 pages, double-spaced, due Week 6 Sunday by 11:59 PM

This initial phase requires you to outline your proposed case study clearly. Include the following sections:

Introduction (~1 page)

Clearly identify your research topic related to international security.

State your central causal research question (e.g., “What factors caused X country to pursue nuclear weapons?”).

Literature Review (~2 pages)

Briefly summarize existing research and theoretical debates relevant to your topic.

Identify the gap your case study addresses.

Argument and Hypothesis (~1-2 page)

Present your main causal argument, clearly stating what you think explains your chosen outcome.

Your argument needs to be grounded in one of the IR theories we explore in the first half of the course.

Operationalize your dependent variable (the security outcome/event you explain) and your independent variables.

Formulate a testable hypothesis derived from your argument.

Case Selection and Evidence (~2-3 pages)

Identify your case(s), justifying explicitly why you chose it/them.

Clearly indicate if you’re doing a most-likely case (testing your theory where you expect the strongest support), a least-likely case (testing your theory under challenging conditions), or a comparative case study (comparing two cases that differ in outcomes or explanatory variables). Show reasoning behind case selection.

Briefly discuss your data sources (historical documents, reports, databases, news archives, etc.)

Provide preliminary visual evidence (e.g., timelines, maps, charts) that supports your initial claims.

Research Project Part 2 – Length: ~5-6 pages, double-spaced, due Week 12 Sunday by 11:59 PM

(Length: Approximately 3-4 pages, double-spaced, excluding tables and bibliography)

This final stage refines your analysis, presenting your tested hypothesis clearly and thoroughly. Sections include:

Methods and Findings (~2 page)

Explicitly discuss why your chosen case study type (most-likely, least-likely, comparative) effectively tests your hypothesis.

Present your main findings and evidence clearly. Provide tables or visuals to illustrate key points.

Discussion (~1-2 page)

Critically analyze what your findings imply for your causal argument.

Address alternative explanations: Could other variables or competing explanations better explain your dependent variable?

Conclusion (~ ½-1 page)

Briefly summarize your research question, main argument, and findings clearly and concisely.

Bibliography (Separate page, APA style)

Research Conference – Length: 10 minute in-class presentation, due Week 15

You will present your research to peers in a 10-minute conference presentation covering:

Research question

Argument and hypothesis

Case selection logic (most-likely, least-likely, comparative, see below)

Key evidence supporting or challenging your argument

Findings (preliminary is okay)

Limitations of your case study

Feedback from your peers and instructor during this session will help strengthen your final submission.

Research Project Part 3 – Final Paper – Length: ~8-10 pages, double-spaced excluding tables, visuals, bibliography, includes Parts I and II combined and final parts added, due End of Finals Week, Sunday by 11:59 PM

Goal: This final stage synthesizes your research into actionable insights.

Findings

Present main findings with supporting tables/visuals.

Discussion (~2 pages)

Assess how governance mechanisms influenced the outcome.

Address alternative explanations and contextual factors.

Policy Recommendations (~1–2 pages)

Provide 2–3 specific, actionable recommendations for IGOs/NGOs/transnational actors. Discuss feasibility, possible barriers, and alternative strategies.

Conclude by summarizing your research question, findings, and implications. (~½–1 page)

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING YOUR CASE STUDY FOR THE FINAL PROJECT

Your case study analysis is a structured, detailed examination designed to rigorously test your hypothesis against empirical evidence. To conduct a high-quality, methodologically sound case study, follow these detailed guidelines:

1. Choose Your Case Study Type

Your choice of case type should align clearly with your research goal. Typical case-study approaches include:

Most-Likely Case:

Select a case where your theory is most expected to succeed—conditions strongly favor your hypothesis.

Purpose: If your hypothesis fails in a most-likely scenario, it likely lacks general validity.

Example: If your theory suggests alliances always form under severe threat, test it in a scenario historically recognized as one of intense threat perception.

Least-Likely Case:

Select a scenario where your hypothesis faces significant obstacles—conditions seem unfavorable.

Purpose: Strong results here indicate powerful support for your hypothesis.

Example: If your theory claims economic interdependence prevents war, test it in a case where countries have a history of conflict despite economic ties.

Comparative Case Study (paired analysis):

Select two or more cases that differ meaningfully on your explanatory or outcome variables.

Purpose: Enables clear identification of causal mechanisms or factors driving divergent outcomes.

Example: Examine two crises with similar conditions but different outcomes (war versus peace), to isolate critical explanatory variables.

2. Define Your Variables Clearly

- a) Dependent Variable (DV): The outcome you aim to explain (e.g., occurrence of war, alliance formation, cyberattack incidence). Specify clearly how you observe or measure it.
- b) Independent Variable(s) (IV): The factor(s) you argue cause the DV. Clearly state and justify each chosen variable and how it will be measured or assessed.

3. Gather Diverse, Reliable Evidence

Your conclusions are only as credible as the quality of your evidence. Utilize multiple sources, such as:

Official documents (government, international organizations, treaties, reports)

Scholarly research (peer-reviewed journals, academic books)

Credible journalism (major international news outlets, investigative reports)

Databases (conflict event datasets, security reports, intelligence assessments)

Expert testimony (speeches, interviews, expert analyses)

Triangulate these sources: evidence from multiple, independent sources strengthens your claims.

4. Conduct Structured, Systematic Analysis

Establish theoretical expectations: Clearly state what you expect to observe if your hypothesis is correct.

Systematic comparison: Evaluate your observed evidence against these expectations. Identify explicitly where evidence supports or contradicts your predictions.

Consider alternative explanations: Actively assess rival theories or competing hypotheses to demonstrate thoroughness and analytical depth.

5. Evaluate and Present Your Findings Clearly

Summarize key pieces of supporting evidence in concise visual forms (tables, timelines, maps).

Provide transparent reasoning for how evidence aligns with or challenges your hypothesis.

Explicitly address any discrepancies or limitations observed.

6. Acknowledge Limitations and Alternative Explanations

A strong analysis is honest about its limitations. Consider:

Missing data or gaps in evidence

Counterfactual scenarios (“what if” conditions had been different)

Variables or factors that could offer alternative explanations

Discussing limitations transparently strengthens your credibility and highlights opportunities for future research.

POLS 3620: International Security
Fall 2025 MW, 1:45PM – 3:25 PM @ TBD

SCHEDULE	TOPIC
Week 1 M (August 25th)	Introduction & Fundamental Concepts Textbook, Chapter 1: Framing a Discipline
Week 1 W (August 27th)	A Brief History I
Week 2 M (September 1st)	<i>Labor Day</i>
Week 2 W (September 3rd)	A Brief History II
Week 3 M (September 8th)	A Brief History III (+ In-class paper brainstorming session)
Week 3 W (September 10th)	Theory I: Realism Textbook, Chapter 2: Realism and Liberalism (first half of chapter) Carr, E. H. (2016). The realist critique. In <i>The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939</i> : Reissued with a new preface from Michael Cox (pp. 62-83). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. Morgenthau, H. J. (2011). A Realist Theory of International Politics. In <i>Security Studies</i> (pp. 118-123). Routledge. Waltz, K. N. (1990). Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory. <i>Journal of International Affairs</i> , 44(1), 21.
Week 4 M (September 15th)	Theory II: Liberalism (+ Infographic Presentations) Textbook Chapter 2: Liberalism (second half of chapter) Woodrow, Wilson. 14 Points. Kant, Immanuel. Perpetual Peace. Doyle, M. W. (1986). Liberalism and world politics. <i>American political science review</i> , 80(4), 1151-1169. Owen, J. M. (1994). How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace. <i>International Security</i> , 19(2), 87-125.
Week 4 W (September 17th)	Theory III: Constructivism (+ Infographic Presentations) Textbook, Chapter 6: Constructivism Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics. <i>International organization</i> , 46(2), 391-425. Hopf, T. (1998). The promise of constructivism in international relations theory. <i>International security</i> , 23(1), 171-200.
Week 5 M (September 22nd)	Theory IV : Critical Security Studies Governance (+ In-class paper brainstorming session) Textbook, Chapter 3 & Chapter 4: Challenging Orthodoxy & Feminist Security Studies Tickner, J. A. (1997). You just don't understand: troubled engagements between feminists and IR theorists. <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> , 41(4), 611-632. Lenin, V. I. (2015). <i>Imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism</i> . Routledge.
Week 5 W (September 24th)	War & Peace I Textbook, Chapter 7: Reflecting on War and Peace Von Clausewitz, Carl. War as an Instrument of Policy. <i>On War</i> . Haas, E. B. (1953). The balance of power. <i>World Politics</i> , 5(4), 442–477. Schelling, T. C (1966). The diplomacy of violence. <i>Arms and Influence</i> .
Week 6 M (September 29th)	War & Peace II Textbook, Chapter 7: Reflecting on War and Peace Fearon, J. D. (1995). Rationalist explanations for war. <i>International organization</i> , 49(3), 379-414. Jervis, R. (1978). Cooperation under the security dilemma. <i>World politics</i> , 30(2), 167-214. Kennan, G. F. (1946). The sources of Soviet conduct. <i>Foreign Aff.</i> , 25, 566. Why the Ukraine crisis is the West's fault: the liberal delusions that provoked Putin. <i>Foreign Aff.</i> , 93, 77.

POLS 3620: International Security
Fall 2025 MW, 1:45PM – 3:25 PM @ TBD

Week 6 W (October 1st)	<p>Military Security I: WMDs</p> <p>Textbook, Chapter 9: Nuclear Proliferation</p> <p>Waltz, K. N. (2012). Why Iran should get the bomb: Nuclear balancing would mean stability. <i>Foreign Affairs</i>, 2-5.</p> <p>Sagan, S. D., & Valentino, B. A. (2017). Revisiting Hiroshima in Iran: What Americans really think about using nuclear weapons and killing noncombatants. <i>International Security</i>, 42(1), 41-79.</p>
Week 7 M (October 6th)	In-class paper brainstorming session
Week 7 W (October 8th)	<p>Military Security II: China</p> <p>Textbook, Chapter 28: China: Security and Threat Perceptions</p> <p>Allison, G. (2017). The Thucydides trap. <i>Foreign Policy</i>, 9(6), 73-80.</p> <p>Mearsheimer, J. M. (2006). China's Unpeaceful Rise. <i>Current History</i>, 105(690), 160-63.</p> <p>Nye Jr, J. S. (2020). Power and interdependence with China. <i>The Washington Quarterly</i>, 43(1), 7-21.</p> <p>Kirshner, J. (2012). The tragedy of offensive realism: Classical realism and the rise of China. <i>European journal of international relations</i>, 18(1), 53-75.</p>
Week 8 M (October 13th)	<p>Military Security III: Israel/Palestine (<i>Guest Lecture by Dr. Ilan Ben-Attar</i>)</p> <p>Samuel, H. (1993). The clash of civilizations. <i>Foreign affairs</i>, 72(3), 22-49.</p>
Week 8 W (October 15th)	<p>Military Security IV</p> <p>Textbook, Chapter 11: Terrorism</p> <p>Kydd, A. H., & Walter, B. F. (2006). The strategies of terrorism. <i>International security</i>, 31(1), 49-80.</p> <p>Fortna, V. P. (2015). Do terrorists win? Rebels' use of terrorism and civil war outcomes. <i>International Organization</i>, 69(3), 519-556.</p> <p>Security Memo Presentation</p>
Week 9 M (October 20th)	<p>United Nations I (+ Security Memo Presentations)</p> <p>Textbook, Chapter 23: the UN and the R2P</p> <p>Axelrod, R., & Keohane, R. O. (1985). Achieving cooperation under anarchy: Strategies and institutions. <i>World politics</i>, 38(1), 226-254.</p> <p>Keohane, R. O., & Martin, L. L. (2014). Institutional theory as a research program. In <i>The Realism Reader</i> (pp. 320-324). Routledge.</p>
Week 9 W (October 22nd)	<p>United Nations II</p> <p>Textbook, Chapter 23: the UN and the R2P</p> <p>Hurd, I. (2011). Is humanitarian intervention legal? The rule of law in an incoherent world. <i>Ethics & International Affairs</i>, 25(3), 293-313.</p> <p>Power, S. (2001). Bystanders to genocide. <i>Atlantic Monthly</i>, 288(2), 84-108.</p>
Week 10 M (October 27th)	<p>Security Organizations</p> <p>Textbook, Chapter 25: Regional Security Organizations</p> <p>Walt, Stephen. Alliance Formation and the balance of World Power. <i>International Security</i>, 36(4), 1985. 3-43.</p> <p>Mearsheimer, J. J. (2017). The false promise of international institutions. In <i>International organization</i> (pp. 237-282). Routledge.</p> <p>Russett, B. M. (1968). Components of an operational theory of international alliance formation. <i>Journal of Conflict Resolution</i>, 12(3), 285-301.</p>
Week 10 W (October 29th)	Research Workshop II
Week 11 M (November 3rd)	<p>Economic Security I</p> <p>Gilpin, R. (1975). The nature of political economy. In <i>US Power and the Multinational Corporation</i> (pp. 20-43). Palgrave Macmillan UK.</p> <p>Gartzke, E. (2007). The capitalist peace. <i>American journal of political science</i>, 51(1), 166-191.</p>
Week 11 W (November 5th)	Economic Security II (<i>Guest Lecture Dr. Tim Cichanowicz</i>)

POLS 3620: International Security
Fall 2025 MW, 1:45PM – 3:25 PM @ TBD

	Drezner, D. W. (2024). Global economic sanctions. <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> , 27. Farrell, H., & Newman, A. L. (2019). Weaponized interdependence: How global economic networks shape state coercion. <i>International security</i> , 44(1), 42-79.
Week 12 M (November 10th)	Environmental Security (<i>Guest Lecture Dr. Melisa Perut</i>) Textbook, Chapter 15: Environmental Security Hardin, G. (1998). Extensions of “the tragedy of the commons.” <i>Science</i> , 280(5364), 682-683. Ostrom, E. (2008). Institutions and the environment. <i>Economic affairs</i> , 28(3), 24-31. (Guest Lecture)
Week 12 W (November 12th)	Human Security Textbook, Chapter 5: Human Security Oxford Bibliography: Human Security Booth, K. (2018). Security and emancipation. In <i>National and international security</i> (pp. 447-460). Routledge. Alkire, S. (2003). A Conceptual Framework for Human Security.
Week 13 M (November 17th)	In-class paper peer workshop
Week 13 W (November 19th)	Health & Food Security Textbook, Chapter 18 & 19: Food & Health Security McInnes, C., & Lee, K. (2006). Health, security and foreign policy. <i>Review of international studies</i> , 32(1), 5-23. Sommerville, M., Essex, J., & Le Billon, P. (2014). The ‘global food crisis’ and the geopolitics of food security. <i>Geopolitics</i> , 19(2), 239-265.
Week 14 M (November 24th)	Space & Cyber Security Textbook, Chapter 36: Space and Security Mutschler, M. M. (2015). Security cooperation in space and international relations theory. In <i>Handbook of Space Security</i> (pp. 41-56). Springer, New York, NY. Borghard, E. D., & Lonergan, S. W. (2017). The logic of coercion in cyberspace. <i>Security Studies</i> , 26(3), 452-481.
Week 14 W (November 26th)	<i>Thanksgiving Break</i>
Week 15 M (December 1st)	Presentation Session I
Week 15 W (December 3rd)	Presentation Session II

Note: This syllabus and its contents are subject to revision; students are responsible for any changes or modifications announced or distributed in class or posted on LMU’s course management system.

WELLNESS:

I care about your health and well-being. Caring for your whole person means balancing your mental, physical, emotional, spiritual and social needs, in addition to your academic commitments. Check out all of these health and wellness resources, from a cookbook to outdoor activities, at www.lmu.edu/lionwellness.

MENTAL HEALTH:

Mental health is a key part of one's overall health. LMU offers confidential Student Psychological Services. Click here to learn more: <https://studentaffairs.lmu.edu/wellness/studentpsychologicalservices/>

SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS:

The DSS Office offers resources to enable students with physical, learning, ADD/ADHD, psychiatric disabilities and those on the autism spectrum to achieve maximum independence while pursuing their educational goals. Staff specialists interact with all areas of the University to eliminate physical and attitudinal barriers. Students must provide documentation for their disability from an appropriate licensed professional. Services are offered to students who have established disabilities under state and federal laws. We also advise students, faculty and staff regarding disability issues. Students who need reasonable modifications, special assistance, academic accommodations or housing accommodations should direct their request to the DSS Office as soon as possible. All discussions will remain confidential. The DSS Office is located on the 2nd floor of Daum Hall and may be reached by email at dsslmu@lmu.edu or phone at (310) 338-4216. Please visit <http://www.lmu.edu/dss> for additional information.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF SEXUAL OR INTERPERSONAL MISCONDUCT:

As “responsible employees,” faculty are required to report any case of suspected sexual or interpersonal misconduct and cannot protect student confidentiality. For information about confidential counseling on campus and for general information about consensual relationships, sexual harassment, and sexual assault, please see the LMU Cares website: <http://studentaffairs.lmu.edu/lmucares/>.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS INFORMATION:

To report an emergency or suspicious activity, contact the LMU Department of Public Safety by phone (x222 or 310-338-2893) or at the nearest emergency call box. In the event of an evacuation, follow the evacuation signage throughout the building to the designated safe refuge area where you will receive further instruction from Public Safety or a Building Captain. For more safety information and preparedness tips, visit <http://www.lmu.edu/emergency> Public Safety can be reached 24 hours a day/7 days a week/365 days a year at 310.338.2893 (or x222 from a campus phone). In a life-threatening emergency, call 9-1-1 first and then call Public Safety if possible. To report an incident, call Public Safety, submit an e-report on the Public Safety website or via the Rave Guardian mobile app, or visit Public Safety in Foley Annex. Review evacuation information and other safety tips posted in each learning space. Make sure you are registered to receive emergency alerts – confirm your contact info at lmu.edu/alert, and download Rave Guardian in the Apple or Google Play store. For more information and emergency preparedness tips, visit <https://publicsafety.lmu.edu>.

COMMUNITY OF CARE:

LMU provides a collaborative case-management program to enhance community safety and support student well-being. This program provides support for prevention, assessment, and intervention as needed to assist students with navigating personal and academic challenges. Faculty can make a community of care referral for students. To learn more about their services, visit: <https://studentaffairs.lmu.edu/wellness/coc/learnmoreaboutus/>

LIBRARY:

The library offers many services to students: <https://library.lmu.edu/student-services/>

You can get help with and “Ask a Librarian” questions here: <https://library.lmu.edu/gethelp/#d.en.174024>

ACADEMIC RESOURCE CENTER:

This center provides student support in the form of writing support, tutoring services, and first-to-go support: <https://academics.lmu.edu/arc/>

ARC Writing & Course Tutoring: The Academic Resource Center provides writing support and peer tutoring in a variety of subjects. Be sure to make tutoring a part of your academic experience when you want feedback on a writing project or help understanding course concepts and preparing for exams. To make an appointment with a tutor, follow the “Writing & Course Tutoring” link in myLMU. Here’s how to reach them: academics.lmu.edu/arc or tutoring@lmu.edu.

First-Generation Student Resources: The Academic Resource Center (ARC) offers academic advising, writing center and tutoring support, and first-generation student resources. For information about these services visit <https://academics.lmu.edu/arc/>

ACADEMIC HONESTY:

Loyola Marymount University is a community dedicated to academic excellence, student-centered education, and the Jesuit and Marymount traditions. As such, the University expects all members of its community to act with honesty and integrity at all times, especially in their academic work. Academic honesty requires that all members of the LMU community act with integrity, respect their own intellectual and creative work as well as that of others, acknowledge sources consistently and completely, act honestly during exams and on assignments, and report results accurately. As an LMU Lion, by the Lion’s Code, you are pledged to join the discourse of the academy with honesty of voice and integrity of scholarship.

Academic dishonesty will be treated as an extremely serious matter, with serious consequences that can range from receiving no credit for assignments/tests to expulsion. It is never permissible to turn in any work that has been copied from another student or copied from a source (including Internet) without properly acknowledging/citing the source. It is never permissible to work on an assignment, exam, quiz or any project with another person unless your instructor has indicated so in the written instructions/guidelines. It is your responsibility to make sure that your work meets the standard of academic honesty set forth in the “Academic Honesty Policy” found at: <https://academics.lmu.edu/honesty/>. For an additional resource, see the “LMU Honor Code and Process” at: https://bulletin.lmu.edu/content.php?catoid=1&navoid=18#LMU_Honor_Code_and_Process