

PSCI 4407B

PUBLIC POLICY: CONTENT AND CREATION

Schedule: Tuesdays, 11:35 am to 2:25 pm

Location: Please confirm on Carleton Central

Instructor: Dr. Vandna Bhatia
D685 Loeb Building
520-2600, ext. 1360

vandna_bhatia@carleton.ca

Office hours: Thursdays, 9:30 to 11:30 am

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

Public policy is a set of decisions (or non-decisions) made by political actors to address an issue, or keep it off the agenda. It can be an expression of ideas, an exercise of power, or the product of history and incremental development. Public policy can be analyzed descriptively – how an issue comes to be viewed as a problem, how a solution among many is selected and implemented and to what effect. We can also think about policy as the outcome of politics – a contest of values, interests, ideas and power among those who engage in making, influencing, analyzing, and studying it.

In this course, we will begin with an understanding of policy as *persuasion* – that is, policy as a *process* of persuading and being persuaded, as well as policy as *content* reflecting ideas, convictions, goals and means. We will critically explore and compare some important approaches to and theories for understanding and analyzing public policy, including the roles of institutions, actors, and ideas that shape public policy. The policy development process – agenda setting, formulation, decision-making, and feedback – will be used to examine different stages of policy creation and the various concepts and theories that help explore how that process unfolds and the content of policies that emerge from it. We will examine a number of specific policy issues to illustrate and apply theoretical concepts from the public policy literature. Students are encouraged to pursue their own areas of policy interest through additional readings, seminar discussions and written course work.

The aim of this course is to prepare students in the foundations of public policy theory and its ‘real world’ applications. Students will develop critical skills through their reading, interpretation, comparison and critical evaluation of these approaches. Students should emerge from this course with skills that will enable them to:

- Compare and contrast differences and similarities across a range of policy theories and/or concepts;
- Synthesize theoretical concepts and integrate them with the policy process;
- Apply these concepts to the critical analysis of practical policy problems;
- Effectively communicate concepts and ideas through oral and written work;
- Demonstrate a strong capacity for critical thinking and independent learning.

COURSE FORMAT AND EVALUATION

This is a seminar class, so attendance is mandatory. Each class will begin with a brief overview of the week's themes and issues by the instructor. Students will be required to briefly present key ideas and lead class discussions drawing on the required readings. *All students are expected to complete the required readings before class and to participate in class discussions.*

The following components comprise the evaluation of students' work in this course:

Participation	15%
Presentation	10%
Thought pieces (4 x 10%)	40%
Final Research Essay	35%
Total	100%

1. Seminar Attendance & Participation: 15%

In a seminar format, student participation is critical. Regular attendance and thorough preparation for each seminar are minimum requirements for all students (see [Active Reading and Preparing for Seminar Discussions](#)). Therefore, attendance in seminars is **mandatory**. In order to receive a passing participation grade, students must attend a **minimum of 10 seminars**. Please notify me in advance (by email), if you have to miss a class for compelling reasons. Exceptions will be made only in those cases of verifiable and documented special circumstances (such as illness or bereavement). Students will be evaluated on the basis of their regular, active, informed and thoughtful oral participation in class discussions. Participation will be evaluated based on the quality and frequency of their oral contributions, with greater weight given to quality. It is expected that you engage with other students' and the instructor's ideas constructively, critically, and respectfully. Quality contributions to class discussions (questions, comments) demonstrate that you have read and grasped the assigned materials; that you can analytically reflect and critically comment on the central ideas of the readings; and that you can make connections between these.

2. Student Presentation: 10%

Each student must give a short presentation (10-15 minutes) introducing and reflecting on the assigned readings for a particular class/topic. The presentation should highlight the central ideas (main points and arguments) of the readings; present analytical and/or critical reflections on these ideas, and raise questions about these ideas for class discussion. Please ensure that presentations are not simply summaries of the assigned readings; they should focus primarily on your own reflections, interpretations and questions about the readings. Presentations may discuss individual readings or address common themes across the readings. Accordingly, the two or three students who will give presentations each week can divide the material by individual texts or thematically. Each

student will receive an individual grade for her or his contribution to the presentation. Students should come to the second class with their first and second choices for presentation weeks.

3. Thought-pieces: 40% (4 @ 10%)

Four short papers will be required throughout the semester. These should be 500-700 words in length and discuss your **critical reflections** (not summaries!) on **at least two** of the required readings from a given week (but not a week in which you are presenting). Thought pieces may include reference to other sources, such as those in the supplementary readings, but this is not required. Thought-pieces should identify what you believe to be the most important ideas, concepts or questions raised in the readings, and demonstrate critical engagement with and analysis of the material. This does not mean that you must be 'critical' of the arguments in the articles, but rather that you engage with the ideas, issues and themes in the readings, discuss why they are (not) convincing, and justify your position. What are the points of tension, intersection and reinforcement between the readings? How do they relate to the topic of that week and/or the broader themes in the course? Thought-pieces are due **before** the readings are discussed in class and must be submitted online via cuLearn no later than 10:00 AM on the day they will be discussed. Students must submit two responses before the Reading Week break. Late reading responses will not be accepted.

4. Policy Analysis Essay: 35% (proposal 5%, essay 30%)

Students are expected to prepare an original analytic paper exploring a specific public policy issue, drawn from topics discussed in class. Specific paper topics must be developed in a brief proposal that includes an overview of the topic and a description of the argument to be made in the paper. This submission will be worth 5% of your essay grade. The essay itself is worth 30% of the final course grade, and should be approximately 4000-5000 words in length. Additional details about and guidelines for the assignment will be distributed in class. The essay will be due via cuLearn on **Wednesday April 11, 2018**. Late papers will be penalized -2% (i.e., -2/30) per day.

Guidelines for Written Work

ALL written work must be uploaded in cuLearn. **Please do not send papers via email.** All sources (class readings or other sources including books, book chapters, articles, internet sources etc.) must be properly referenced in the text, with page citations where appropriate. Parenthetical references (author surname, date, page number) are preferred but any recognized citation style is acceptable. Evaluation of papers is based on: (a) the merits (originality, persuasiveness) of your argument; (b) the logic and clarity of your argument; (c) the appropriateness and relevance of the cited readings (including a consistent citation style); (d) correct English grammar, spelling, and usage. There will be no extensions, except in cases of a documented medical or family emergency.

CULearn

The course has a CULearn page that contains electronic copies of the syllabus and guidelines and information concerning assignments and presentations. Presentations and other course related material, such as links to online resources and reserved readings, will also be posted here. CULearn also has a discussion forum, which students are encouraged to use to post thoughts, questions or comments concerning the course or to continue class discussions. I will moderate the site as needed, and post information there as well.

TOPIC SCHEDULE AND READINGS

Required Readings & Textbooks

The following book is required for the course and is available through [Haven Books](#) located at 43 Seneca Street (at Sunnyside), Ottawa and will also be on reserve at MacOdrum Library. The text is also available electronically through the publisher.

Cairney, P. (2012). *Understanding Public Policy: Theories and Issues*. Palgrave MacMillan Press.

Most other required readings are available electronically through MacOdrum Library website and/or via the electronic reserves (Ares) link in the course cuLearn site.

I. WHAT IS PUBLIC POLICY?

1. January 9: Introduction – What is Public Policy?

Required Reading:

- Cairney, Chapter 1 (Introduction) pp. 1-21
- Cairney, Chapter 2 (What is Public Policy?), pp. 22-44

Supplementary Reading:

- Goodin, Rein & Moran (2006). The public and its policies. In M. Moran, M. Rein & R.E. Goodin. Eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford: OUP. [E-book available via university library]
- Hassel A. (2015). Public Policy. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Second Edition, Volume 19, pp. 569-575 [E-book available via university library]
- Stone, D. (2012). The Market and the Polis, in *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*, 3rd ed., pp. 19-36. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.

2. January 16: Making Public Policy – Power and Persuasion

Required Reading:

- Cariney, Chapter 3 (Power and Public Policy), pp. 46-68
- Crawford N.C. (2009). Homo politicus and argument (nearly) all the way down: Persuasion in politics. *Perspectives on Politics*, 7(1):103-124.

Supplementary Reading:

- Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1962). Two faces of power. *American Political Science Review*, 56(4): 947-952.
- McFarland, A. (2015). Power. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Second Edition, Volume 19, pp. 760-764 [E-book available via university library]
- Torgerson, D. (1986). Between knowledge and politics: Three faces of policy analysis. *Policy Sciences* 19(1): 33-59.

II. INSTITUTIONS, INTERESTS AND IDEAS: THEORIES OF THE POLICY PROCESS

3. January 23: Institutionalism – Constitutional Structures and Institutional Rules

How are institutions defined? What is 'path dependence' and what does it tell us about how institutions influence the policy process? How can (federal) institutions shape rules and strategic choices in policy decision-making?

Required Reading:

- Cairney, Chapters 4 (Institutions and 'New Institutionalism'), pp. 69-93
- Cairney, Chapter 8 (Multilevel Governance), pp. 154-174
- Lecours, A., & Béland, D. (2009). Federalism and fiscal policy: The politics of equalization in Canada. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 40(4), 569-596.

Supplementary Reading:

- Hall, P.A. & Taylor, R.C.A. (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies*, 44(5): 936-957
- March, JG & Olsen, JP (1996). Institutional perspectives on political institutions. *Governance*, 9(3): 47-64
- Pierson, P. (1995). Fragmented welfare states: Federal institutions and the development of social policy. *Governance*, 8(4), 449-478.
- Scharpf, F.W. (1988). The joint decision trap: Lessons from German federalism and European integration. *Public Administration* 66(Autumn): 239-278.
- Tsebelis, G. (1995). Decision making in political systems: Veto players in presidentialism, parliamentarism, multicameralism and multipartyism. *British Journal of Political Science*, 25:289-325

4. January 30: Interests – Rationality and Incrementalism

What are the core tenets and assumptions of rational choice theory and of incrementalism? What is bounded rationality? How effective and/or useful are rational choice theory and/or incrementalism for understanding and explaining the policymaking process and policy change?

Required Reading:

- Cairney, Chapter 5 (Rationality and Incrementalism) pp. 94-110
- Cairney, Chapter 7 (Rational Choice Theory), pp. 132-153
- Lodge, M., & Wegrich, K. (2016). The rationality paradox of Nudge: rational tools of government in a world of bounded rationality. *Law & Policy*, 38(3), 250-267.

Supplementary Reading:

- Hay, C. (2004). Theory, stylized heuristic or self-fulfilling prophecy? The status of rational choice theory in public administration. *Public Administration*, 82(1), 39-62.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of muddling-through. *Public Administration Review*, 19, 79-88
- Ostrom, E. (1998). A behavioral approach to the rational choice theory of collective action: Presidential address, American Political Science Association, 1997. *American Political Science Review*, 92(1), 1-22.
- Pontusson, J. (1995). From comparative public policy to political economy: Putting political institutions in their place and taking interests seriously. *Comparative Political Studies*, 28(1), 117-147.

5. February 6: Ideas and Policy Paradigms

What is meant by 'ideas' in policy analysis? What types of ideas influence policymaking and how? What is the relationship between ideas and interests? Under what conditions or circumstances can ideas be influential?

Required Readings:

- Campbell, J. L. (2002). Ideas, politics, and public policy. *Annual review of sociology*, 28(1), 21-38.
- Hall, P. (1993). Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: The case of economic policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics*, 25(3), 275-296

Supplementary Readings:

- Berman, S. (2001). Ideas, norms, and culture in political analysis. *Comparative Politics*, 33(2):231-50
- Goldstein J. and Keohane R. (1993). Ideas and Foreign Policy: An Analytical Framework. In Judith Goldstein and Robert Keohane, (eds.) *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change*. Cornell University Press, 3-30
- Kangas, O.E., Niemelä M. and Varjonen S. (2014). When and why do ideas matter? The influence of framing on opinion formation and policy change. *European Political Science Review*, 6, 73-92.
- Mehta, J. (2013). How paradigms create politics: the transformation of American educational policy, 1980–2001. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(2), 285-324.
- Moore M.H. (1988). What sort of ideas become public ideas? In Robert B. Reich, ed., *The Power of Public Ideas*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Chapter 3, pp. 55-84
- Surel, Y. (2000). The role of cognitive and normative frames in policy-making. *Journal of European public policy*, 7(4), 495-512.

6. February 13: Critical Perspectives – Constructivism and Policy Discourse

What is 'policy discourse'? What is 'critical' about discursive policy analysis? How does it challenge traditional or mainstream assumptions about and approaches to policy?

Required Readings:

- Gottweis, H. (2006). Argumentative policy analysis. In J. Pierre and B.G. Peters [eds.] *Handbook of Public Policy*. Sage Publications, pp. 461–480
- Bacchi, C. (2004). Policy and discourse: challenging the construction of affirmative action as preferential treatment, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11(1): 128-146

Supplementary Readings:

- Bacchi, C.L. (2000). Policy as discourse: what does it mean? Where does it get us? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 21(1): 45–57.
- Fischer, F. & Gottweis, H. (2013). The argumentative turn in public policy revisited: twenty years later, *Critical Policy Studies*, 7(4): 425-433.
- Hawkesworth, M. (2010). Policy discourse as sanctioned ignorance: theorizing the erasure of feminist knowledge, *Critical Policy Studies* 3(3-4): 268-289.
- Howarth, D. (2010). Power, discourse, and policy: articulating a hegemony approach to critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies*, 3(3-4): 309-335.
- Schmidt, V.A. (2011). Speaking of change: why discourse is key to the dynamics of policy transformation. *Critical Policy Studies*, 5(2): 106-126.

February 20: Reading Week Break

III. MODELS OF THE POLICY PROCESS

7. February 27: Punctuated Equilibria and Policy Networks

What factors contribute to and reinforce policy equilibria? What are policy punctuations? How and under what conditions do they occur? What is the role of networks of policy actors in influencing the nature and timing of policy punctuations?

Required Reading:

- Cairney, Chapter 9 (Punctuated Equilibrium), pp. 175-199
- Givel, M. (2006). Punctuated equilibrium in limbo: The tobacco lobby and US state policymaking from 1990 to 2003. *Policy Studies Journal*, 34(3), 405-418.

Supplementary Reading:

- Hall, P. (1993). Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: The case of economic policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics*, 25(3), 275-296
- Howlett, M., & Migone, A. (2011). Charles Lindblom is alive and well and living in punctuated equilibrium land. *Policy and Society*, 30(1), 53-62.
- Jones, B. D., & Baumgartner, F. R. (2012). From there to here: Punctuated equilibrium to the general punctuation thesis to a theory of government information processing. *Policy Studies Journal*, 40(1), 1-20.
- Richardson, J. (2000). Government, interest groups and policy change. *Political Studies*, 48(5): 1006-25.
- Studlar, D. T., & Cairney, P. (2014). Conceptualizing punctuated and non-punctuated policy change: tobacco control in comparative perspective. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 80(3), 513-531.

8. March 6: The Advocacy Coalition Framework

What is a policy subsystem? How do advocacy coalitions and policy subsystems influence the policy process, and in particular, contribute to policy learning and change? What is the role of expertise and knowledge in this process? How are advocacy coalitions different from other types of actor networks?

Required Reading:

- Cairney, Chapter 10 (The Advocacy Coalition Framework), p. 200-219
- Stritch, A. (2015). The Advocacy Coalition Framework and nascent subsystems: Trade union disclosure policy in Canada. *Policy Studies Journal*, 43(4), 437-455.

Supplementary Reading:

- Béland, D., & Cox, R. H. (2016). Ideas as coalition magnets: coalition building, policy entrepreneurs, and power relations. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(3), 428-445.
- Dowding, K. (1995). Model or metaphor? A critical review of the policy network approach. *Political studies*, 43(1), 136-158.
- Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International organization*, 46(1), 1-35.
- Heinmiller, B.T., Pirak, K. (2017). Advocacy Coalitions in Ontario Land Use Policy Development, *Review of Policy Research*, 34(2), 168-185

- Matti, S., & Sandström, A. (2013). The defining elements of advocacy coalitions: continuing the search for explanations for coordination and coalition structures. *Review of Policy Research*, 30(2), 240-257.
- Ostrom E. (2014) Collective action and the evolution of social norms. *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research*, 6:4, 235-252.
- Weible, C.M., T. Heikkila, P. DeLeon, and P.A. Sabatier (2012). Understanding and influencing the policy process. *Policy Sciences* 45(1): 1–21.

9. March 13: Multiple Streams and the Definition of Alternatives

What are the main elements and streams of Kingdon's multiple streams approach? How useful is it for explaining the agenda-setting process? What is the role of ideas in Kingdon's framework? What kind of ideas are influential and in which stream(s) are they most central?

Required Reading:

- Cairney, P., & Zahariadis, N. (2016). Multiple streams approach: a flexible metaphor presents an opportunity to operationalize agenda setting processes. In N. Zahariadis [ed.] *Handbook of Public Policy Agenda Setting*, Edward Elgar Publishing, 87-105
- Jones S. (2014) Flirting with climate change: A comparative policy analysis of subnational governments in Canada and Australia, *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 16:5, 424-440

Supplementary Reading:

- Béland, D. (2015). Kingdon reconsidered: ideas, interests and institutions in comparative policy analysis. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 6988(January): 1–15.
- Cairney, Chapter 11 (The Role of Ideas), pp. 220-243
- Cairney, P., & Jones, M. D. (2016). Kingdon's multiple streams approach: what is the empirical impact of this universal theory? *Policy Studies Journal*, 44(1), 37-58.
- Cohen, M.D., March, J. G. and Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organisational choice, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17: 1-25.
- Downs, A. (1972). Up and down with ecology – the 'issue attention cycle'. *The Public Interest* 28: 38-50.

10. March 20: Policy Stories and Narrative Analysis

What are the elements of persuasive policy stories? How do narratives influence the policy process? How do they affect the content of policy decisions? What distinguishes narrative analysis from multiple streams approaches?

Required Reading:

- Merry, M. K. (2017). Angels versus devils: The portrayal of characters in the gun policy debate. *Policy Studies Journal*, doi:10.1111/psj.12207
- Stone, D.A. (1989). Causal Stories and the formation of policy agendas. *Political Science Quarterly* 104(2): 281–300.

Supplementary Reading:

- McGinty, E.E., J.A. Wolfson, T.K. Sell, D.W. Webster (2016). Common sense or gun control? Political communication and news media framing of firearm sale background checks after Newtown. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, 41 (1): 3–40.

- Rochefort D.A. and Cobb R.W. (1993). Problem definition, agenda access, and policy choice. *Policy Studies Journal*, 21(1): 56-71.
- Schneider, A., & Ingram, H. (1993). Social construction of target populations: Implications for politics and policy. *American Political Science Review*, 87(2), 334-347.
- Shanahan, E.A., M.D. Jones, and M.K. Mcbeth (2011). Policy narratives and policy processes. *Policy Studies Journal* 39(3): 535–61.
- Smith-Walter, A., Peterson, H. L., Jones, M. D., & Nicole Reynolds Marshall, A. (2016). Gun stories: How evidence shapes firearm policy in the United States. *Politics & Policy*, 44(6), 1053-1088.

IV. POLICY DECISION-MAKING AND CHANGE

11. March 27: Credit Claiming and Blame Avoidance

Under what conditions are policymakers likely to claim credit versus deflect blame for policy decisions? What are the processes by which blame avoidance occurs? How does blame avoidance affect policy processes and outcomes in the long term?

Required Reading:

- Hinterleitner, M. (2017). Reconciling perspectives on blame avoidance behaviour. *Political Studies Review*, 15(2): 243-254.
- Wenzelburger, G., & König, P. D. (2017). Different by design? Analyzing how governments justify GMO liberalization through the lens of strategic communication. *Review of Policy Research*, 34(3): 331-356.

Supplementary Reading:

- Bachrach, P. and Baratz M.S. (1963). Decisions and non-decisions: An analytical framework. *American Political Science Review*, 57 (3): 632–642.
- Hinterleitner, M. (n.d.). Policy failures, blame games and changes to policy practice. *Journal of Public Policy*, 1-22.
- Hood C., Jennings W. and Copeland P. (2016) Blame avoidance in comparative perspective: Reactivity, staged retreat and efficacy. *Public Administration* 94(2): 542–562.
- Howlett, M. (2012). The lessons of failure: Learning and blame avoidance in public policy-making. *International Political Science Review*, 33 (5): 539-555.
- Howlett, M. (2014). Why are policy innovations rare and so often negative? Blame avoidance and problem denial in climate change policy-making. *Global Environmental Change*, 29: 395-403.
- Nelson, M. (2016). Credit-claiming or blame avoidance? Comparing the relationship between welfare state beliefs and the framing of social policy retrenchment in France and Germany. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 18(2): 138-156.
- Weaver, R. K. (1986). The politics of blame avoidance. *Journal of Public Policy*, 6(4), 371-398.

12. Apr 3: Policy Feedback and Learning

What is policy feedback? What are differences between positive and negative feedback, and how they influence policy change? What are the sources or forms of feedback?

Required Readings:

- Jacobs, A. M., & Weaver, R. K. (2014). When policies undo themselves: Self-undermining feedback as a source of policy change. *Governance*, 28(4): 441-457
- Oberlander, J., & Weaver, R. K. (2015). Unraveling from within? The Affordable Care Act and self-undermining policy feedbacks. *The Forum*, 13(1): 37-62.

Supplementary Reading:

- Béland, D. (2010). Reconsidering policy feedback: How policies affect politics. *Administration & Society*, 42(5), 568-590.
- Bennett, C. J., & Howlett, M. (1992). The lessons of learning: Reconciling theories of policy learning and policy change. *Policy Sciences*, 25(3), 275-294.
- Campbell, A.L. (2012). Policy makes mass politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15: 333-351.
- Moynihan, D. P. and Soss, J. (2014). Policy feedback and the politics of administration. *Public Administration Review*, 74: 320-332.
- Pierson, P. (1993). When effect becomes cause: Policy feedback and political change. *World Politics*, 45(04), 595-628.
- Weaver, K. (2010). Paths and forks or chutes and ladders? Negative feedbacks and policy regime change. *Journal of Public Policy*, 30(2): 137-162.

13. April 10: International Influences and Domestic Public Policy

What are non-domestic sources of policy learning and transfer? What are mechanisms by which international and global factors influence domestic policy change?

Required Readings:

- Stone, D., & Ladi, S. (2015). Global public policy and transnational administration. *Public Administration*, 93(4): 839-855.
- Paterson, M., Hoffmann, M., Betsill, M., & Bernstein, S. (2014). The micro foundations of policy diffusion toward complex global governance: An analysis of the transnational carbon emission trading network. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(3), 420-449.

Supplementary Readings:

- Cairney, Chapter 12 (Policy Transfer), pp. 244-264
- Coleman, W. D. (2012). Governance and global public policy. In D. Levi-Faur (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 673-685
- Stone, D.A. (2008). Global public policy, transnational policy communities, and their networks. *Policy Studies Journal*, 36(1): 19-38.

Academic Accommodations

The Paul Menton Centre for Students with Disabilities (PMC) provides services to students with Learning Disabilities (LD), psychiatric/mental health disabilities, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD), chronic medical conditions, and impairments in mobility, hearing, and vision. If you have a disability requiring academic accommodations in this course, please contact PMC at 613-520-6608 or pmc@carleton.ca for a formal evaluation. If you are already registered with the PMC, contact your PMC coordinator to send me your **Letter of Accommodation** at the beginning of the term, and no later than two weeks before the first in-class scheduled test or exam requiring accommodation (*if applicable*). After requesting accommodation from PMC, meet with me to ensure accommodation arrangements are made. Please consult the PMC website for the deadline to request accommodations for the formally-scheduled exam (*if applicable*).

For Religious Observance: Students requesting accommodation for religious observances should apply in writing to their instructor for alternate dates and/or means of satisfying academic requirements. Such requests should be made during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist, but no later than two weeks before the compulsory academic event. Accommodation is to be worked out directly and on an individual basis between the student and the instructor(s) involved. Instructors will make accommodations in a way that avoids academic disadvantage to the student. Instructors and students may contact an Equity Services Advisor for assistance (www.carleton.ca/equity).

For Pregnancy: Pregnant students requiring academic accommodations are encouraged to contact an Equity Advisor in Equity Services to complete a *letter of accommodation*. Then, make an appointment to discuss your needs with the instructor at least two weeks prior to the first academic event in which it is anticipated the accommodation will be required.

Plagiarism: The University Senate defines plagiarism as “presenting, whether intentional or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one’s own.” This can include:

- 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;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another’s data or research findings;
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another’s works and/or failing to use quotation marks;
- handing in "substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs.

Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course’s instructor. The Associate Deans of the Faculty conduct a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. Penalties are not trivial. They may include a mark of zero for the plagiarized work or a final grade of "F" for the course.

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).

Submission and Return of Term Work: Papers must be submitted directly to the instructor according to the instructions in the course outline and will not be date-stamped in the departmental office. Late assignments may be submitted to the drop box in the corridor outside B640 Loeb. Assignments will be retrieved every business day at 4 **p.m.**, stamped with that day's date, and then distributed to the instructor. For essays not returned in class please attach a **stamped, self-addressed envelope** if you wish to have your assignment returned by mail. Final exams are intended solely for the purpose of evaluation and will not be returned.

Grading: Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor, subject to the approval of the faculty Dean. Final standing in courses will be shown by alphabetical grades. The system of grades used, with corresponding grade points is:

Percentage	Letter grade	12-point scale	Percentage	Letter grade	12-point scale
90-100	A+	12	67-69	C+	6
85-89	A	11	63-66	C	5
80-84	A-	10	60-62	C-	4
77-79	B+	9	57-59	D+	3
73-76	B	8	53-56	D	2
70-72	B-	7	50-52	D-	1

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

Carleton E-mail Accounts: All email communication to students from the Department of Political Science will be via official Carleton university e-mail accounts and/or cuLearn. As important course and University information is distributed this way, it is the student's responsibility to monitor their Carleton and cuLearn accounts.

Carleton Political Science Society: The Carleton Political Science Society (CPSS) has made its mission to provide a social environment for politically inclined students and faculty. Holding social events, debates, and panel discussions, CPSS aims to involve all political science students at Carleton University. Our mandate is to arrange social and academic activities in order to instill a sense of belonging within the Department and the larger University community. Members can benefit through numerous opportunities which will complement both academic and social life at Carleton University. To find out more, visit <https://www.facebook.com/groups/politicalsciencesociety/> or come to our office in Loeb D688.

Official Course Outline: The course outline posted to the Political Science website is the official course outline.