

PAPM 4000E – AI and Public Policy

Lectures: Mondays from 18:05 to 20:55

Lecture Format: In-Person

Fall 2026 – September 14 to December 07

Department of Public Affairs and Policy Management: <https://carleton.ca/bpapm/>

Instructor: Dr. Dilara Baysal

Email: dilarabaysal3@cunet.carleton.ca

Office Hours and Location: Online Thursday 2pm-4pm (By appointment only).

Brightspace: **TBA**

Course Description:

PAPM 4000 [0.5 credit]

Capstone Seminar in Public Affairs and Policy Management

Policy workshop focusing on the application of public affairs analysis to develop problem solving and research skills. Seminar is policy-focused and organized by area of Specialization in the program. Students, working in small groups, examine concrete policy problems, actual or simulated, in specific institutional contexts.

Prerequisite(s): PAPM 3000 and Good Standing in the Bachelor of Public Affairs and Policy Management program.

Overview:

Artificial intelligence is increasingly embedded in economic, political, and administrative processes, raising important questions about how these technologies are developed, governed, and integrated into society. Understanding AI as a public policy issue requires looking beyond the technology itself to examine the actors, institutions, infrastructures, and political-economic relationships that shape its development and use. It also requires attention to competing ideas about the role of governments in promoting, regulating, and deploying AI while balancing innovation, economic development, rights, accountability, sustainability, and the public interest.

The course begins by developing a foundational understanding of contemporary AI before examining the political economy and material infrastructure underlying its development. Students will explore issues surrounding labour, data and extraction; computing infrastructure and environmental consequences; corporate concentration and power; relationships between technology companies and states; and debates over technological sovereignty. Building on this foundation, the course examines different approaches to AI governance, including the institutions, policy instruments, and levels of governance involved in regulating and overseeing AI.

The course then turns to major contemporary policy challenges, including the use of AI in government and automated decision-making, the changing nature of work and labour markets, and emerging concerns surrounding information, democracy, safety, and regulation. Through

academic scholarship, policy documents, contemporary cases, seminar discussions, and written and oral assignments, students will critically assess competing approaches to AI governance and develop the capacity to analyze policy problems and formulate evidence-based policy recommendations.

Course Format:

The course combines lectures, seminar discussions, student-led discussions, and policy-focused activities. Lectures will introduce key concepts, debates, policy frameworks, and contemporary issues, while seminar discussions will provide opportunities to critically engage with assigned readings and explore different perspectives on AI and public policy. Students are expected to complete assigned readings before class and participate actively in discussions. The final weeks of the course will include student policy panels, providing an opportunity to present, compare, and discuss policy analysis and recommendations with the class.

Learning Outcomes:

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

1. Explain the basic functioning of contemporary AI systems and identify the material, economic, and labour infrastructures that support their development.
2. Analyze major political, economic, social, and environmental implications of AI.
3. Identify key institutions, actors, regulatory approaches, and levels of governance involved in AI policy.
4. Compare and critically evaluate Canadian and international approaches to AI governance.
5. Assess major AI policy challenges, including public-sector use, labour-market impacts, corporate power, accountability, safety, and democratic governance.
6. Develop and communicate evidence-based policy analysis and recommendations on contemporary AI policy issues.

Required Course Materials:

Students are not required to purchase textbooks or other learning materials for this course.

All other readings can be accessed through the Ares reserve system on Brightspace.

Course Evaluation:

Submission Policy: All written assignments must be submitted electronically via Brightspace. Each assignment will have its own dedicated module for uploading. Submissions should be in Microsoft Word format only (PDFs will not be accepted). File names must follow the format: lastname_firstname_assignment# (e.g., Smith_Jane_Assignment1).

Late submission policy: Any assignments that are submitted after the stated due dates, and without valid reason for extension, will be penalized five percent (10%) per day. Furthermore, any assignment submitted seven days following the stated due date will not be accepted, resulting in an immediate score of zero (0%). Extensions will be granted on a case-by-case basis, and at the discretion of the course instructor. Any requests for extensions must be submitted to the instructor at least 48-hours before an assignment's indicated due date. This requirement will only be waived in the event of emergency. Valid reasons for extension include medical or emergency situations.

Citation Style: Students may use any citation style with which they are familiar, provided that the chosen style is used consistently throughout the assignment. Recommended citation styles include: *Harvard (Author–Date)*: <https://university.open.ac.uk/library/referencing-and-plagiarism/quick-guide-to-harvard-referencing-cite-them-right>
APA (7th edition): <https://libguides.mcmaster.ca/APA>
Chicago (Author–Date): https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide/citation-guide-2.html

General overview:

Assignment/Task	Due Date	Value
Attendance and In-Class Participation	Ongoing	20%
Discussion Facilitation	Date assigned to students	10%
Reflection #1 (Week 1- 4)	October 13	15%
Policy Brief topic confirmed with the instructor	November 2	N/A
Reflection # 2 (Week 5- 8)	November 20	15%
Policy Panels	November 30 & Dec 7	10%
Policy Briefs due:	Dec 7	20%

Assignments and Evaluation – Details:

A note on assignments: *Additional details about assignments will be posted to Brightspace and discussed in-class closer to the due date.*

Attendance and In-Class Participation (20%): Students are expected to attend all classes and participate actively in seminar discussions throughout the semester. To support productive and informed discussion, students should complete the assigned readings before each class. Participation will be evaluated based on the quality and relevance of contributions, including students' understanding of key arguments, concepts, debates, and supporting evidence. Consideration will also be given to students' ability to engage thoughtfully with their peers and to make meaningful connections between readings, themes, and discussions from different weeks.

Reflection Paper (1 & 2) (15 % each): Students will complete two reflection papers of approximately 1,000–1,200 words each. Reflection Paper #1 will cover readings and themes from Weeks 1–4, while Reflection Paper #2 will focus on Weeks 5–8. For each paper, students will select the readings and themes they wish to explore and are not expected to address every reading. Papers should identify a clear theme, question, debate, or issue and engage closely with the most relevant course materials. The purpose is not to summarize the readings but to develop

critical analysis and reflection. Students may compare perspectives, examine disagreements, evaluate arguments, connect ideas across readings, or apply course concepts to real-world issues and examples. Papers should demonstrate how the selected readings inform the student's own thinking and perspective. Evaluation will consider critical reflection, engagement with readings, coherence and development of ideas, use of evidence and examples, organization and clarity, and meaningful connections across readings, themes, and broader issues.

Discussion Facilitation (10%): Each student will select a week from **Week 2 to Week 9** in which they will facilitate a seminar discussion. Weeks will be selected on a first-come, first-served basis, with up to two or three students assigned to the same week. When multiple students are scheduled for a given week, they are expected to coordinate with one another in advance to organize the session and determine how they will jointly facilitate the discussion. For their assigned week, students should come prepared with three to four thoughtful discussion questions that engage with the central themes, arguments, concepts, or debates raised in the assigned readings. Students should also incorporate relevant real-world examples, current events, cases, or practical applications to connect the course material to broader social, political, or economic issues. The purpose of the facilitation is not simply to summarize the readings, but to generate meaningful discussion and critical engagement with the week's material. Facilitators are expected to guide the conversation, encourage participation from their classmates, respond to different perspectives, and draw connections between the assigned readings and broader themes explored in the course.

Policy Brief and Panel Discussion (30%)

Students must finalize their policy framework (Canada, European Union, or OECD) choice and specific AI policy issue with the instructor no later than **November 2**.

Policy Brief (20%): Students will prepare a policy brief examining a specific AI policy issue within one of the following frameworks: [Canada's National Artificial Intelligence Strategy: AI for All](#), European Union's [AI Continent Action Plan](#) and [Apply AI Strategy](#) or OECD's [OECD AI Principles](#).

Writing from the perspective of a policy analyst advising the relevant government or international organization, students will:

- define a specific AI policy problem;
- assess the existing policy approach and identify relevant strengths, limitations, or gaps;
- evaluate alternative policy options; and
- develop a clear, feasible, and evidence-based policy recommendation.

The brief should demonstrate an understanding of the selected policy framework and use appropriate evidence and research to support the analysis and recommendation.

Policy Panel Presentation (10%): During the final two weeks of the course, students will participate in panels organized around the policy issues examined in their briefs. Students working on related issues will be grouped together—for example, AI and labour, environment and

infrastructure, privacy and surveillance, misinformation, AI safety, or public-sector AI. Each student will briefly present the main argument and recommendation from their policy brief. The remainder of the panel will consist of discussion among panel members and questions from the class. The purpose of the panel is to compare different approaches to the same or related policy problems and explore trade-offs, competing policy objectives, implementation challenges, and areas of disagreement. Students should be prepared to explain and defend the recommendations developed in their policy brief and respond to alternative perspectives raised by other panelists and the class.

Seminar and Reading Schedule:

Week 1 (September 14) – Understanding Artificial Intelligence

- The Alan Turing Institute. (2024). *What is generative AI and how does it work? – The Turing Lectures with Mirella Lapata* [Video]https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_6R7Ym6Vy_I
- Pasquinelli, M. (2019). How a machine learns and fails: A grammar of error for artificial intelligence. *Spheres: journal for digital cultures*, 5(11), 1-17.
- Alvarado, R. (2023). What kind of trust does AI deserve, if any?. *AI and Ethics*, 3(4), 1169-1183.

Recommended:

- Suchman, L. (2023). The uncontroversial ‘thingness’ of AI. *Big Data & Society*, 10(2), 20539517231206794.
- Winner, L. (1980). Do Artifacts Have Politics? *Daedalus*, 109(1), 121–136.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20024652>

Week 2 (September 21) – The Political Economy of AI: Labour, Data and Extraction

- Muldoon, J., Cant, C., Wu, B., & Graham, M. (2024). A typology of artificial intelligence data work. *Big data & society*, 11(1), 20539517241232632.
- Crawford, K. & Paglen, T. (2019) Excavating AI: the politics of training sets for machine learning. <https://excavating.ai>.
- Schulz, M., & Loewen-Colón, J. (2026). Preventing AI extractivism: the case for braiding indigenous data justice with ABS for stronger AI data governance. *AI & SOCIETY*, 1-15.
- Le Ludec, C., Cornet, M., & Casilli, A. A. (2023). The problem with annotation. Human labour and outsourcing between France and Madagascar. *Big Data & Society*, 10(2), 20539517231188723.

Recommended:

- Vertesi, J., Boyd, D., Taylor, A. S., & Shestakofsky, B. (2026, June). Reckoning with the Political Economy of AI: Avoiding Decoys in Pursuit of Accountability. In *The 2026 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 2186-2205). <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/3805689.3806739>
- Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco. (2021). *Kate Crawford on “Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence”* [Video] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KcefG-0InLE>

Week 3 (September 28) – AI Infrastructure: Compute, Chips, Energy and Environment

- Kollar, J. (2026). GOVERNING THE CLOUD: Infrastructural statecraft and the political ecology of digital expansion in Oregon. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1468-2427.70098>
- Au, Y. (2024). Data centres on the Moon and other tales: A volumetric and elemental analysis of the coloniality of digital infrastructures. *Territory, politics, governance*, 12(1), 12-30. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/21622671.2022.2153160>
- Nost, E., & Colven, E. (2022). Earth for AI: A political ecology of data-driven climate initiatives. *Geoforum*, 130, 23-34.
- Amoores, L. (2018). Cloud geographies: Computing, data, sovereignty. *Progress in human geography*, 42(1), 4-24.

Recommended:

- Chen, S. (2026, June 23). Canada’s AI strategy must reckon with the environmental implications of data centres. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/canadas-ai-strategy-must-reckon-with-the-environmental-implications-of-data-centres-285333>
- Kollar, J., & Stokols, A. (2026). Geopolitical ecologies of cloud capitalism: Territorial restructuring and the making of national computing power in the US and China. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 58(1), 38-58. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0308518X251369704>

Week 4 (October 5) – Who Controls AI? Corporate Power, Markets and Sovereignty

- Khanal, S., Zhang, H., & Taeihagh, A. (2025). Why and how is the power of Big Tech increasing in the policy process? The case of generative AI. *Policy and Society*, 44(1), 52-69. <https://academic.oup.com/policyandsociety/article/44/1/52/7636223>

- Saari, L. (2026). Capital ecosystem of European AI: Patriotic billionaires, development banks, and the evolution of state-finance nexus. *Competition & Change*, 10245294261429545. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/10245294261429545>
- Luitse, D. (2024). Platform power in AI: The evolution of cloud infrastructures in the political economy of artificial intelligence. *Internet Policy Review*, 13(2), 1-44. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/300740/1/1897437501.pdf>

Recommended:

- Tan, J. S., & Thelen, K. (2026). Cloud capitalism and the AI transition. *Politics & society*, 54(2), 184-214. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00323292251396395>
- Singh, M., & Reuel, A. (2025, October). The Silicon Sovereignty Paradox: Navigating Fluid State-Corporate Power Dynamics in the Age of AI. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society* (Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 2399-2409). <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AIES/article/view/36725/38863>

Thanksgiving Holiday (October 12) – No Class

Week 5 (October 19) – ONLINE CLASS - Governing AI: Policy Frameworks & Instruments

- Radu, R. (2021). Steering the governance of artificial intelligence: national strategies in perspective. *Policy and society*, 40(2), 178-193. <https://academic.oup.com/policyandsociety/article/40/2/178/6509308>
- Batool, A., Zowghi, D., & Bano, M. (2025). AI governance: a systematic literature review. *AI and Ethics*, 5(3), 3265-3279. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s43681-024-00653-w>
- Orwat, C., Bareis, J., Folberth, A., Jahnel, J., & Wadehul, C. (2024). Normative challenges of risk regulation of artificial intelligence. *NanoEthics*, 18(2), 11. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s11569-024-00454-9.pdf>
- Saari, L., & Mügge, D. (2026). Forking paths of AI governance—how risk management frameworks shape the politics of AI. *Critical Policy Studies*, 1-21. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/19460171.2026.2669063>

Recommended:

- Liang, G. (2026). Governing the amorphous: AI, social justice, and the challenge of future-proof regulation. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 13, 102467.

- Baysal, D. (2026, June 25). Trust is not a strategy: Why Canada must govern AI decisions, not just data. *Open Canada*. <https://opencanada.org/trust-is-not-a-strategy-why-canada-must-govern-ai-decisions-not-just-data/>

Fall Break (October 26 – 30) – No Classes

Week 6 (November 2) – AI in Government: Automated Decision-Making, Public Services and Accountability

- Green, B. (2022). The flaws of policies requiring human oversight of government algorithms. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 45, 105681. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2022.105681>
- Agbabiaka, O., Ojo, A., & Connolly, N. (2025). Requirements for trustworthy AI-enabled automated decision-making in the public sector: A systematic review. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 215, 124076.
- Jones, M. L. (2017). The right to a human in the loop: Political constructions of computer automation and personhood. *Social studies of science*, 47(2), 216-239.

Recommended:

- OECD (2025), *Governing with Artificial Intelligence: The State of Play and Way Forward in Core Government Functions*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/795de142-en>.
- Karlin, M. (2018, February 1). Deploying AI responsibly in government. *Policy Options*. <https://policyoptions.irpp.org/2018/02/deploying-ai-responsibly-in-government>

Week 7 (November 9) – AI, Work and the Labour Policy

- Deranty, J.-P., & Corbin, T. (2024). Artificial intelligence and work: A critical review of recent research from the social sciences. *AI & Society*, 39, 675–691. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01496-x>
- Scriptor, L. (2026). Is artificial intelligence a threat to meaningful work and living? Technological unemployment and the existential challenges of a transitional era. *AI & society*, 1-18. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s00146-026-02941-x.pdf>
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366–410. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174>

- Ogunde, F. (2024). Algorithmic management of platform workers: An examination of the Canadian and European approaches to regulation. *European Labour Law Journal*, 15(4), 803–821. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20319525241239632>

Recommended:

- OECD (2026), “Recent policy developments on AI in the labour market”, *OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers*, No. 63, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/c0ffced7-en> **[Select sections relevant to your work and interests]**
- De Stefano, V. (2022). The EU Commission’s proposal for a Directive on Platform Work: an overview. *Italian Labour Law e-Journal*, 15(1), 1-11.
- European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2024). *Directive (EU) 2024/2831 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2024 on improving working conditions in platform work*. <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/PE-89-2024-INIT/en/pdf>

Week 8 (November 16) – ONLINE CLASS – AI Governance in Healthcare and Education

- Wang, Y. (2024). Algorithmic decisions in education governance: Implications and challenges. *Discover Education*, 3(1), 229. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s44217-024-00337-x.pdf>
- Cross, J. L., Choma, M. A., & Onofrey, J. A. (2024). Bias in medical AI: implications for clinical decision-making. *PLOS digital health*, 3(11), e0000651. <https://journals.plos.org/digitalhealth/article?id=10.1371/journal.pdig.0000651>
- Colonna, L. (2026). Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED): Towards more effective regulation. *European journal of risk regulation*, 17(1), 161-181.

Recommended:

- Da Silva, M., Flood, C. M., & Herder, M. (2022). Regulation of health-related artificial intelligence in medical devices: the Canadian story. *UBCL Rev.*, 55, 635. https://digitalcommons.schulichlaw.dal.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2047&context=scholarly_works

Week 9 (November 23) – AI, Knowledge, Copyright and Privacy.

- McKelvey, F., Simon, B., & Frizzera, L. (2026). Generative AI and the information commons: controversy, copyright, and closure. *Information, Communication & Society*, 29(6), 1890-1911.
- Kay, J., Kasirzadeh, A., & Mohamed, S. (2024, October). Epistemic injustice in generative AI. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society* (Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 684-697).
- De La Durantaye, K. (2025). Control and Compensation. A Comparative Analysis of Copyright Exceptions for Training Generative AI: K. de la Durantaye. *IIC-International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 56(4), 737-770.

Recommended:

- Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada. (2025). *Consultation on copyright in the age of generative artificial intelligence: What we heard report*. Government of Canada https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2025/isde-ised/Iu173-41-1-2025-eng.pdf
- European Commission. (n.d.). *Data protection under GDPR*. https://commission.europa.eu/law/law-topic/data-protection/legal-framework-eu-data-protection_en
- U.S. Copyright Office. (n.d.). *Copyright and artificial intelligence*. <https://www.copyright.gov/ai/>

Week 10 (November 30) – Participation and AI Governance + Policy Panel I

- Coeckelbergh, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence, the common good, and the democratic deficit in AI governance. *AI and Ethics*, 5(2), 1491-1497. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s43681-024-00492-9>
- Ulnicane, I. (2025). Governance fix? Power and politics in controversies about governing generative AI. *Policy and Society*, 44(1), 70-84.
- Jasanoff, S. (2003). Technologies of humility: Citizen participation in governing science. *Minerva*, 41(3), 223-244.

Week 11 (December 7) – Alternative Approaches to AI Governance + Policy Panel II

- Verdegem, P. (2024). Dismantling AI capitalism: the commons as an alternative to the power concentration of Big Tech. *AI & society*, 39(2), 727-737. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s00146-022-01437-8.pdf>

- Feenberg, A. (1992). Subversive rationalization: Technology, power, and democracy. *Inquiry*, 35(3-4), 301-322.
https://www.sfu.ca/~andrewf/books/Subversive_Rationalization_Technology_Power_Democracy.pdf

Appendix

i. Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

The University Academic Integrity Policy defines plagiarism as “*presenting, whether intentionally or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one’s own.*” This includes reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else’s published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one’s own without proper citation or reference to the original source. Examples of sources from which the ideas, expressions of ideas or works of others may be drawn from include but are not limited to books, articles, papers, literary compositions and phrases, performance compositions, chemical compounds, artworks, laboratory reports, research results, calculations and the results of calculations, diagrams, constructions, computer reports, computer code/software, material on the internet and/or conversations.

Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

- any submission prepared in whole or in part, by someone else, including the unauthorized use of generative AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT)
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, paraphrased material, algorithms, formulae, scientific or mathematical concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment
- using another’s data or research findings without appropriate acknowledgement
- submitting a computer program developed in whole or in part by someone else, with or without modifications, as one’s own failing to acknowledge sources with proper citations when using another’s work and/or failing to use quotations marks.”

Plagiarism is a serious offence that cannot be resolved directly by the course’s instructor.

The Associate Dean of the Faculty follows a rigorous [process for academic integrity allegations](#), including reviewing documents and interviewing the student, when an instructor suspects a violation has been committed. Penalties for violations may include a final grade of “F” for the course.

ii. Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools (e.g., Chat GPT)

Any use of generative AI tools to produce assessed content is considered a violation of academic integrity standards. This applies to take-home assignments, exams, or class discussions.

iii. Requests for Academic Accommodation

Carleton is committed to providing academic accessibility for all individuals. You may need special arrangements to meet your academic obligations during the term. The accommodation request processes, including information about the *Academic Consideration Policy for Students in Medical and Other Extenuating Circumstances*, are outlined on the Academic Accommodations website (students.carleton.ca/course-outline).

iv. Statement on Student Mental Health

As a student you may experience a range of mental health challenges that significantly impact your academic success and overall well-being. If you need help, please speak to someone. There are numerous resources available both on- and off-campus to support you. For more information, please consult <https://wellness.carleton.ca/>

• Mental Health Resources:

Emergency Resources (on and off campus)

- Crisis/Urgent Counselling Support: 613-520-6674 (Mon-Fri, 8:30-4:30)
- Suicide Crisis Helpline: call or text 9-8-8, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.
- For immediate danger or urgent medical support: call 9-1-1

Carleton Resources

- Mental Health and Wellbeing: <https://carleton.ca/wellness/>
- Health & Counselling Services: <https://carleton.ca/health/>
- Paul Menton Centre: <https://carleton.ca/pmc/>
- Academic Advising Centre (AAC): <https://carleton.ca/academicadvising/>
- Centre for Student Academic Support (CSAS): <https://carleton.ca/csas/>
- Equity & Inclusivity Communities: <https://carleton.ca/equity/>

Off Campus Resources

- Distress Centre of Ottawa and Region: call 613-238-3311, text 343-306-5550, or connect online at <https://www.dcottawa.on.ca/>
- Mental Health Crisis Service: call 613-722-6914 or toll-free 1-866-996-0991, or connect online at <http://www.crisisline.ca/>
- Good2Talk: call 1-866-925-5454 or connect online at <https://good2talk.ca/>
- The Walk-In Counselling Clinic: for online or on-site service <https://walkincounselling.com>

v. Final Grade Approval

As per the Carleton University Undergraduate Calendar, letter grades are assigned based on the following percentages:

	+		-
--	---	--	---

A	90-100	85-89	80-84
B	77-79	73-76	70-72
C	67-69	63-66	60-62
D	56-59	53-56	50-52
F	Below 50		

Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor subject to the approval of the Faculty Dean. This means that grades submitted by the instructor may be subject to revision. No grades are final until they have been approved by the Dean.

vi. Statement on Student Conduct

Student or professor materials created for this course (including presentations and posted notes, labs, case studies, assignments and exams) remain the intellectual property of the author(s). They are intended for personal use and may not be reproduced or redistributed without prior written consent of the author(s).

vii. Student Conduct

All communications, whether in-person or via e-mail should be professional and respectful and should remain consistent with the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy:

<https://carleton.ca/studentaffairs/student-rights-and-responsibilities/>