PSY407
From Psychology to Evidence-Based Policy
Understanding Applications of Psychological Science in the Public and Nonprofit Sectors

University of Oregon
Department of Psychology
Winter 2019
Credits: 2-3

Instructor:	Course Meetings:
Alex Garinther	Straub Hall, Room 257
Office: Straub 468	Tuesdays 4:00-5:50pm
Office Hours: TH 12:00-1:30pm	Max Enrollment: 16 students

Prerequisites: While there are no formal prerequisites, work in this course requires some understanding of scientific methods, statistical inference, and government structures and systems. The course rests on a philosophy of science that recognizes the outputs of scientific research as knowledge products that, when properly utilized, can combat social problems and contribute to the betterment of collective social functioning.

Suggested for: Juniors, seniors or other upper-level, motivated undergraduates who are majoring in psychology, PPPM, marketing, political science, economics, sociology or related fields.

Aim: To form an integrative understanding of the ways in which the social and behavioral sciences (psychology, behavioral economics, and other fields) can and do meaningfully inform the processes of policy making, evaluation, and updating. This includes the leveraging of scholarly research in preparing to formulate new policies, as well as the active monitoring and evaluation of existing policies through quantitative analysis and program evaluation.

Topics to be discussed include: cognitive biases and their relation to decision making, common resource dilemmas, collective action problems, implicit biases and their consequences, law and criminal justice, public health issues, choice architecture/decision contexts, new institutions such as "nudge units" and policy labs, ethical considerations in nudging, program evaluation techniques, and more.

By the end of the course, students should be able to:
- Identify limitations, improvements, opportunities, and applications of research from the social and behavioral sciences
- Critically interpret scientific conclusions as educated consumers of research
- Situate research contributions within their broader context
- Think creatively about policy adaptations and improvements that are based in quantitative analysis
- Begin to recognize one's own biases; demonstrate a familiarity with tools for clear thinking
- Speak thoughtfully about the process by which research can be applied to policy

Assignments:

Assignment Breakdown	*% of Grade*
Participation	15
Weekly Reflections	50
Lead a Discussion	10
Larger Report in Innovative Thinking	25
Total	*100*

Class Participation:
This is a seminar-based course and everyone is expected to participate in class discussions. Each student should try to make at least one thoughtful comment per class. Discussions are the backbone of this course and students should come prepared to discuss what they have read prior to each meeting. Attendance will be counted as part of this participation grade, but just attending a class is not the same as participating in it.

Weekly Reflection Papers:
By Friday at 5pm of each week, students should write a brief (300-400 word) reflection on the Canvas site about a particular aspect of the topic we discussed that week. This reflection should contain novel thoughts (that either build or add to, but don't just restate, ideas discussed in class), and should be careful to avoid uninformed speculation or unsupported claims. The aim of these reflections is to provide a pointed, specific, critical analysis of one key point that grabs your interest (or in some cases two key points – but the idea is to keep these brief and focused). The reflection papers are not meant to be a summary of everything covered that week. Students are encouraged to write about whatever particular aspect of the given topic attracted them.
These papers will be graded on a 5-point scale. Top-quality work will receive a 5/5.
> Late Policy: If you submit a 300-400 word reflection by the due date, you will receive at least a 2/5. If you miss the due date, the highest grade you can receive is a 4/5. Submissions more than one week late will not be counted.
> Rate Each Reading: In addition to word count, the other required part of each reflection submission is rating (on a 0-10 scale) how much you liked each reading/podcast for that week. At the top of each submission, students should list these ratings (0=hated it, 10=loved it) for each assigned reading, even if you don't address all/that particular reading in your post.

Lead a Discussion / Paper Presentation:
Each week, a group of two to three students will lead the class through a discussion of one paper that compliments the assigned readings. Presenting students should create a brief handout (no more than one piece of paper) that summarizes the essential background, methods, main findings, and limitations and assumptions of the selected reading. Please email the document to me 24-hours in advance of the class meeting, and I will print copies for everyone.

Presenting students should also come prepared with a series of thought-provoking discussion questions that will be used to stimulate conversation among the class. These questions should be written on the back side (second page) of the handout. After the initial presentation of the reading (which might last ~15/20 minutes or so), these discussion questions will help transition the class from presentation mode to group-discussion mode.

Larger Report in Innovative Thinking:
This will be a 3-5 page paper (not including references). You will be asked to "set the stage" by presenting a problem, or area of opportunity, to which behavioral science could be feasibly applied in order to improve the current situation. A more detailed handout with instructions for this project will be provided during the term. Students who enroll in the course for three credits will have a more substantial version of the assignment than those who enroll for two. All due dates are posted on Canvas.

Readings:

This course assigns 2-3 brief readings (and sometimes a podcast to listen to) for each session. This approach allows us to engage with a wide range of topics without demanding an unreasonable number of pages to be read each week. This course has no textbook, and instead will draw on a variety of journal articles, book chapters, and commentaries (most of which are relatively short).

 *Note: It is important that you please do the readings. The livelihood of the discussion suffers when only a few people participate. It is important that every student comes to class with at least some understanding of what each assigned reading has to say. Ideally students will be able to thoughtfully ingest, carefully review, and critically consider every assigned paper prior to each class. Because this ideal is not always possible (students have other obligations, things come up), there may be days when you can't commit as much time as you'd like to the readings; on those days, I ask that every student come to class at least having some understanding (the gist) of each paper, so that discussions can still run smoothly and we can engage meaningfully with the material.

Overview of Readings – Three Phases of the Course

Phase 1	Weeks 1-2 > No Presentations	Orientation
Phase 2	Weeks 3-8 > Presentations	Survey of Topic Areas
Phase 3	Weeks 9-10 > No Presentations	Conclusions

****

Phase 1 – Course Orientation

****

Week 1: Science For Good

Research from psychology and related sciences can be used to improve social life. What is the history of this sort of thinking? What does applied social science look like? How should we think about the terms 'basic' and 'applied' research? Historically, how have scholars understood these topics, and what is the current state of affairs?

W1 Required Reading: Scientific Foundations, Scientific Usefulness
Watts, D. J. (2017). Should social science be more solution-oriented?. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *1*, 0015.

Fox, C. R. & Sitkin, S. B. (2015) "Bridging the divide between behavioral science & policy" *Behavioral Science and Policy*, 1(1), p.16-30

Podcast: http://govinnovator.com/Matt-Notowidigdo
Using Random-Assignment in Policy Making

W1 Optional Further Readings:
Cook, T. D., Campbell, D. T., & Shadish, W. (2002), "Experiments and Generalized Causal Inference" (Ch. 1) in *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Wilson, T. (2011). *Redirect: The surprising new science of psychological change*. Penguin UK. Chapters 1-2.

Behn, R. D. (1998). The new public management paradigm and the search for democratic accountability. *International Public Management Journal*, *1*(2), 131-164.

Oullier, O. (2013). Behavioural insights are vital to policy-making. *Nature*, *501*(7468), 463. http://doi.org/10.1038/501463a

Walton, G. M. (2014). The new science of wise psychological interventions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *23*(1), 73-82.

Week 2: When Policy is Based on Evidence

How/when do public officials utilize scientific products in the construction of policies, rules, and regulations? How/when do they fail to do so? What are the limitations and abuses of "evidence," and of this kind of approach? How can we do this well?

W2 Required Reading: Historical Origins and Modern Considerations in Evidence-Based Policy
Dahl, R. A. (1947). The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems. *Public Administration Review*, *7*(1), 1–11. http://doi.org/10.2307/972349

Wilson, T. D. & Juarez, L. P. (2015) "Intuition is not evidence: prescriptions for behavioral - interventions from social psychology" *Behavioral Science and Policy*, 1(1), p.1-15

Podcast: http://govinnovator.com/Nick-Hart
Making the most of the data the government already collects

W2 Optional Further Reading:
Haynes, L., Service, O., Goldacre, B., & Torgerson, D. (2012). *Test, Learn, Adapt: Developing Public Policy with Randomised Controlled Trials* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 2131581). Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2131581

Head, B. W. (2010). Reconsidering evidence-based policy: Key issues and challenges. *Policy and society*, *29*(2), 77-94.

Caplan, N., & Nelson, S. D. (1973). On being useful: The nature and consequences of psychological research on social problems. *American Psychologist, 28*, 199.

Wilson, W. (1887). The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, *2*(2), 197. http://doi.org/10.2307/2139277

Skinner, B. F. (1971), "A technology of behavior." In *Beyond freedom and dignity*. New York: Knopf.

****

Phase 2 – A Survey of Topic Areas

****

Week 3: Collective Action Problems, Resource Dilemmas, and Other Social Traps
These readings ground an understanding of social behavior in some of the most fundamental policies in the public sphere: taxation; resource regulation; and producing, promoting, and preserving the "public good". What are some new and innovative ways researchers can help achieve these ends?

W3 Required Reading: The Commons
Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. The population problem has no technical solution; it requires a fundamental extension in morality. *Science, 162*(3859), 1243–1248.

Van Vugt, M. (2009). Averting the tragedy of the commons: Using social psychological science to protect the environment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *18*(3), 169-173.

Presentation:
Rand, D. G., Dreber, A., Ellingsen, T., Fudenberg, D., & Nowak, M. A. (2009). Positive interactions promote public cooperation. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, *325*(5945), 1272–1275. http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1177418

W3 Optional Further Readings:
Walker, J. M., Gardner, R., Herr, A., & Ostrom, E. (2000). Collective Choice in the Commons: Experimental Results on Proposed Allocation Rules and Votes. *The Economic Journal*, 110(460), 212–234. http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0297.00497

Ostrom, E. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions For Collective Action* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990)

Komorita, S. S., & Parks, C. D. (1996). *Social Dilemmas* (New edition edition). Madison, Wis.: Westview Press.

Week 4: Biases and Heuristics in Economic Decision-Making
The way our minds reason about money, quantity, and value is often anything but "rational." Advancements in cognitive science and judgment and decision-making shine a light on behaviors relevant to personal finance and retirement savings plans, as well as issues that disproportionally affect the poor, like gambling, playing the lottery, credit card debt, and payday lending.

W4 Required Reading: Biases and Heuristics
Bernartzi, Shlomo and Richard H. Thaler. "Heuristics and Biases in Retirement Savings Behavior." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 21(3), (2007): 81-104.

Podcast: http://govinnovator.com/lisa-massena/
On the "OregonSaves" Program

Skim:
Santos, L. R., & Rosati, A. G. (2015). The evolutionary roots of human decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*, 321–347. http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015310

Presentation:
Mani, A., Mullainathan, S., Shafir, E., & Zhao, J. (2013). Poverty impedes cognitive function. *Science,* 341, 976–980.

W4 Option Further Readings:
Camerer, C., & Kunreuther, H. (1989). Decision Processes for Low Probability Events: Policy Implications. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 8*(4), 565-592. doi:10.2307/3325045

Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., & Thaler, R. H. (1991). Anomalies: The endowment effect, loss aversion, and status quo bias. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 193–206.

Van Boven, L., Westfall, J. A., & Travers, M. W., & McClelland, G. (2013). Judgment and Decision Making. In D. E. Carlston (Ed.), Oxford Handbook of Social Cognition (pp. 375–401). New York: Oxford University Press.

Week 5: Prejudice and Automaticity
Our tendency to categorize the world is essential to human functioning; it also leads to stereotyping and prejudice, sometimes without our knowing it. Social biases, especially those based on race and gender, can lead to unjust social problems like healthcare disparities, unfair hiring outcomes, and other discriminatory behaviors. Often times these biases operate automatically—that is, without deliberate, conscious effort.

W5 Required Reading: Combating Prejudice in Organizations
Bertrand, M. & Mullainathan, S. (2004) Are Emily And Greg More Employable Than Lakisha And Jamal? A Field Experiment On Labor Market Discrimination, *American Economic Review*, 991-1013.

Hardin, C. D., & Banaji, M. R. (2013). The nature of implicit prejudice: Implications for personal and public policy. In E. Shafir (Ed.), *Behavioral foundations of policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Presentation:
Lai, C. K., Skinner, A. L., Cooley, E., Murrar, S., Brauer, M., Devos, T., Calanchini, J., Xiao, Y. J., Pedram, C., Marshburn, C. K., Simon, S., Blanchar, J. C., Joy-Gaba, J. A., Conway, J., Redford, L., Klein, R. A., Roussos, G., Schellhaas, F. M. H., Burns, M., Hu, X., McLean, M. C., Axt, J. R., Asgari, S., Schmidt, K., Rubinstein, R., Marini, M., Rubichi, S., Shin, J. L., & Nosek, B. A. (in press). Reducing implicit racial preferences: II. Intervention effectiveness across time. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.

W5 Optional Further Reading:
Nosek, B. A., & Riskind, R. G. (2012). Policy implications of implicit social cognition. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *6*(1), 113–147.

Williams, D. R., & Mohammed, S. A. (2009). Discrimination and racial disparities in health: evidence and needed research. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *32*(1), 20. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-008-9185-0

Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., Wittenbrink, B., Sadler, M. S., & Keesee, T. (2007). Across the thin blue line: Police officers and racial bias in the decision to shoot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(6), 1006–1023. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1006

Week 6: Psychology, Law, and Criminal Justice
Do we have justice system calibrated to a current understanding of human cognition and behavior? Could we ever? Is the validity of long-standing traditions in criminal justice, like jury selection and eye-witness testimony, supported by the evidence? What does it look like (or should it look like) when psychological phenomena, and an empirical understanding of them, become relevant in the courtroom?

W6 Required Reading: Legal Staples
Wells, G. & Quinlivan, D. (2009). Suggestive Eyewitness Identification Procedures and the Supreme Court's Reliability Test in Light of Eyewitness Science: 30 Years later. *Law & Human Behavior*, 33, 1-24.

Ellsworth, P. & Reifman, A. (2000). Juror comprehension and public policy: Perceived problems and proposed solutions. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law,* 6, 788-821.

Presentation:
Sommers, S. & Marotta, S. (2014) Racial Disparities in Legal Outcomes: On Policing, Charging Decisions, and Criminal Trial Proceedings. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences.* 1(1), p. 103-111.

Week 7: Public Health, Addiction, and Obesity

How can psychological research inform policies that promote public health? Can the design of a cafeteria really influence what and how much people will eat? In thinking about addiction and craving, how can researchers translate their understanding of the neurophysiological mechanisms involved in these processes into effective policy-level interventions? And right here in Oregon, how are researchers making use of big data and random assignment in order to optimize the health care system?

This week we will also check in about final reports.

W7 Required Reading: Clever Solutions to Shared Problems
Baicker, K., Taubman, S. L., Allen, H. L., Bernstein, M., Gruber, J. H., Newhouse, J. P., ... & Finkelstein, A. N. (2013). The Oregon experiment—effects of Medicaid on clinical outcomes. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *368*(18), 1713-1722.

See also: https://www.nber.org/oregon/1.home.html

Presentation:
Wilson, B. M., Stolarz-Fantino, S., & Fantino, E. (2013). Regulating the Way to Obesity: Unintended Consequences of Limiting Sugary Drink Sizes. *PLoS ONE*, *8*(4), e61081. http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0061081

W7 Optional Further Reading
Woolf, S. H. (2008). The meaning of translational research and why it matters. *Jama*, *299*(2), 211-213.

Fisher, P.A., & Berkman, E.T. (2015). Designing interventions informed by scientific knowledge about effects of early adversity: A translational neuroscience agenda for next-generation addictions research. *Current Addiction Reports*.

Wansink, B. (2014). *Slim by Design*. New York, N.Y: Harper Collins.

Muñoz, R. F., Bunge, E. L., Chen, K., Schueller, S. M., Bravin, J. I., Shaughnessy, E. A., & Pérez-Stable, E. J. (2016). Massive Open Online Interventions A Novel Model for Delivering Behavioral-Health Services Worldwide. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *4*(2), 194–205. http://doi.org/10.1177/2167702615583840

****

Phase 3 – Conclusions
****

Week 8: The Enormous Power of Decision Contexts
The way spaces are designed can have a tremendous impact on how people behave in those spaces. Across a wide variety of situations, 'smart designs', or scientifically-informed 'choice architectures,' can set people up to make better choices.

W8 Required Reading: Default Rules and Other Nudges
Loewenstein, G., Bryce, C., Hagmann, D., & Rajpal, S. (2015). Warning: You are about to be nudged. *Behavioral Science & Policy*, *1*(1), 35-42.

Li, D., Hawley, Z., & Schnier, K. (2013). Increasing organ donation via changes in the default choice or allocation rule. *Journal of Health Economics*, *32*(6). http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2013.09.007

Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YqwCPwkiVn4
Cass Sunsitein, A Book Talk on '*Why Nudge*'

W8 Optional Further Reading:
Thaler, Richard H. and Sunstein, Cass R. and Balz, John P., Choice Architecture (December 10, 2014). *The Behavioral Foundations of Public Policy*, Ch. 25, Eldar Shafir, ed. (2013)

Thaler R, H., & Sunstein C, R. (2008). Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. Chapters 1-2.

Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. (2004). Citizen Participation in Decision Making- Is It Worth The Effort?. *Public Administration Review*, *64*(1), 55-65.

Sunstein, C. R. (2016). Do people like nudges? Working Paper from SSRN.
Pay attention to Section III – "Partisan Nudge Bias" – and feel free to check out this article from Cass in the NYT: "The Curious Politics of the Nudge"
https://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/27/opinion/sunday/the-curious-politics-of-the-nudge.html?_r=0

Barton, A., & Grüne-Yanoff, T. (2015). From Libertarian Paternalism to Nudging—and Beyond. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, *6*(3), 341–359. http://doi.org/10.1007/s13164-015-0268-x

Week 9: Applying Behavioral Insights to the Nonprofit Sector
The tools of social science as we have discussed them so far can be incredibly useful when applied to the nonprofit sector. In fact, the flexibility and opportunistic mindset of nonprofit operations makes in area an especially fruitful place to look for work with our newfound toolkit. One particular application involves fundraising—this is something most if not all nonprofits must do, and the psychological research on charitable giving can lend a hand in this effort.

W9 Required Reading: Fundraising and Charitable Giving
Mason, D. P. (2013). Putting charity to the test: A case for field experiments on giving time and money in the nonprofit sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *42*(1), 193-202.

Erlandsson, A., Västfjäll, D., Sundfelt, O., & Slovic, P. (2016). Argument-inconsistency in charity appeals: Statistical information about the scope of the problem decrease helping toward a single identified victim but not helping toward many non-identified victims in a refugee crisis context. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *56*, 126-140.

Week 10: Perspective, Limitations, Misfires, and the Future

This class has focused on the promoting the value of evidence-based policy, but a balanced discussion of the topic can not ignore the limitations, practical complexities, and even dangers that come along with scientifically-informed (or any) policy implementation. What sorts of behavioral interventions are most likely to be worthwhile and effective? In what areas should we apply more caution?

W10 Required Reading: Limitations, Caveats, and Improvements
Parkhurst, J. O. (2016). Appeals to evidence for the resolution of wicked problems: the origins and mechanisms of evidentiary bias. *Policy Sciences*, *49*(4), 373-393.

Browse: The Rise of Policy Labs, Overview of Panel Discussion at the 3rd Annual Meeting of International Public Policy Association, Singapore
http://www.ippapublicpolicy.org/panel/pdfPanel.php?panel=87&conference=7
http://www.ippapublicpolicy.org/conference/icpp-3-singapore-2017/panel-list/7/panel/the-rise-of-policy-labs/87

W10 Optional Further Reading:
Esses, V. M., Semenya, A. H., Stelzl, Dovidio, J. F., & Hodson, G. (2006). Maximizing social psychological contributions to addressing social issues: The benefits of interdisciplinary perspectives. In P. A. M. van Lange (Ed.), Bridging social psychology: Benefits of transdisciplinary approaches (pp. 403-408). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Aimone, J. A. (2015). Policymaking: Some rules for behavioural science. *Nature*, *526*(7573), 323–323. http://doi.org/10.1038/526323e

Lanovaz, M. J., & Rapp, J. T. (2015). Using Single-Case Experiments to Support Evidence-Based Decisions How Much Is Enough? *Behavior Modification*, 0145445515613584. http://doi.org/10.1177/0145445515613584

Dennard, L. F., Richardson, K. A., & Morçöl, G. (Eds.). (2008). "Agent-based modelling for public service policy development : a new framework for policy development". In *Complexity and policy analysis: tools and concepts for designing robust policies in a complex world*. Goodyear, AZ: ISCE Pub.

Morçöl, G. (2001). Positivist beliefs among policy professionals: An empirical investigation. *Policy Sciences*, *34*(3-4), 381–401.

Paul Brest, Quis Custodiet Ipsos Custodes?: Debiasing the Policy Makers Themselves, in *The Behavioral Foundations of Public Policy*, Eldar Shafir, ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2000). Foundational models for 21st century program evaluation. In *Evaluation models* (pp. 33-83). Springer, Dordrecht.

Tetlock, P. E. & Mellers, B. (2014), Judging political judgment. *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences,* 111 (32), 11574-11575.

Dickert, S., Västfjäll, D., Kleber, J., & Slovic, P. (2015). Scope insensitivity: The limits of intuitive valuation of human lives in public policy. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *4*(3), 248–255. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2014.09.002

Afif, Z. (2017) ""Nudge units" – where they came from and what they can do"
http://blogs.worldbank.org/developmenttalk/nudge-units-where-they-came-and-what-they-can-do

Gregory, R., McDaniels, T., & Fields, D. (2001). Decision aiding, not dispute resolution: creating insights through structured environmental decisions. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *20*(3), 415-432.

Podcast: Maya-Shankar
http://govinnovator.com/maya_shankar/
Applying behavioral insights at the federal level

Note these readings are in sequence: (#1) an original publication in the journal *Perspectives on Psychological Science,* followed by two commentaries (#2, #3, below).

#1 Bennis, W. M., Medin, D. L., & Bartels, D. M. (2010). The costs and benefits of calculation and moral rules. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(2), 187–202. http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610362354

#2 Bazerman, M. H., & D. Greene, J. (2010). In Favor of Clear Thinking: Incorporating Moral Rules Into a Wise Cost-Benefit Analysis--Commentary on Bennis, Medin & Bartels (2010). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*(2), 209–212. http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610362362

#3 Tetlock, P. E., & Mitchell, G. (2010). Situated Social Identities Constrain Morally Defensible Choices: Commentary on Bennis, Medin, & Bartels (2010). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(2), 206–208.

Communication In and Out of Class

When communicating with your instructor via email, please put "PSY407" at the very start of the subject line, and then add some detail (e.g., "PSY407 Question about Readings"). Please feel free to speak up about any questions or concerns before, during, or after class (or in office hours). A goal for the course is to form an open communication climate in which everyone feels comfortable raising questions and having discussions during our weekly class sessions. Discussion is an important part of this class, and anytime you are communicating with your peers, inside and outside of class, please remember to be respectful, patient, and thoughtful.

Student Workload

When you complete this course, you will earn either two or three credits toward your degree. Three credits is the equivalent of 90 hours of work across the term (9 hours/week for 10 weeks) and two credits are equal to 60 hours of work across the term (6 hours/week). You will spend approximately two hours in class each week, and the rest of your hours will come from reading and performing assignments.

Academic Honesty

All work submitted in this course must be your own. The use of sources must be properly acknowledged and documented *(when in doubt, cite! If still unsure, ask*!), and you must write all papers yourself (no copying from other students, or having someone else write the paper for you). If I suspect academic dishonesty (cheating, plagiarism, etc.) I will contact you directly to discuss the issue, and will report it to the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards unless the discussion convinces me that my suspicions are unwarranted. My preferred sanction is a failing grade for the paper or the course, depending on the severity of the violation. The Student Conduct Committee may decide on additional actions. If you are unclear about what constitutes academic dishonesty, please ask me, or see the Student Conduct Code at https://studentlife.uoregon.edu/conduct, or at:
http://uodos.uoregon.edu/StudentConductandCommunityStandards/AcademicMisconduct.aspx

Expectations and Grading

Grades will be distributed as follows:

A+	97-100%	B+	87-89%	C+	77-79%	D+	67-69%	F	0-59%
A	93-96%	B	83-86%	C	73-76%	D	63-66%		
A-	90-92%	B-	80-82%	C-	70-72%	D-	60-62%		

The psychology department has specific guidelines on the level of achievement they think each letter grade should signify. Descriptions, here:
http://psychology.uoregon.edu/courses/department-grading-standards/

Late Assignments

There is no guarantee that you will be given credit for late work. If you think you might miss an assignment deadline, the best thing to do is to contact the instructor as soon as possible in advance with an explanation and proposal for when the assignment can be turned in. It is at the instructor's discretion whether or not to accept late work, as well as what the penalty will be. While the policy for late reflections was outlined above, major assignments may not be accepted late. It is possible they will receive -10% (out of 100%) for each day they are late, but any specific policy on late submissions must be worked out between individual students and the instructor.

Special Accommodations

Accessible Education Center (AEC)

If you have a documented disability and anticipate needing accommodations in this course, please make arrangements to meet with the instructor as soon as possible. Also, please request that a counselor at the Accessible Education Center (uoaec@uoregon.edu, tel. 541-346-1155) send a letter verifying your disability. For a list of resources provided by the Accessible Education Center, please see http://aec.uoregon.edu.

If Writing Is a Particular Challenge for You

If you think you may have extra challenges with writing assignments, whether because English is not your native language or because your writing skills are weak for other reasons, please plan on consulting the writing tutors at the Tutoring and Learning Center (TLC) on the 4th floor of Knight Library. Drop in hours can be found here: https://tlc.uoregon.edu/subjects/writing/

Students for Whom English is a Second Language

If you are a non-native English speaker and think you may have trouble in this course due to language difficulties, please see the instructor as soon as possible to make any necessary special arrangements.

Resources and Respect

Prohibited Discrimination and Harassment Reporting

Any student who has experienced sexual assault, relationship violence, sex or gender-based bullying, stalking, and/or sexual harassment may seek resources and help at safe.uoregon.edu. To get help by phone, a student can also call either the UO's 24-hour hotline at 541-346-7244 [SAFE], or the non-confidential Title IX Coordinator at 541-346-8136. From the SAFE website, students may also connect to Callisto, a confidential, third-party reporting site that is not a part of the university.

Students experiencing any other form of prohibited discrimination or harassment can find information at respect.uoregon.edu or aaeo.uoregon.edu or contact the non-confidential AAEO office at 541-346-3123 or the Dean of Students Office at 541-346-3216 for help. As UO policy has different reporting requirements based on the nature of the reported harassment or discrimination, additional information about reporting requirements for discrimination or harassment unrelated to sexual assault, relationship violence, sex or gender based bullying, stalking, and/or sexual harassment is available at http://aaeo.uoregon.edu/content/discrimination-harassment(link is external)

Specific details about confidentiality of information and reporting obligations of employees can be found at https://titleix.uoregon.edu(link is external).

Mandatory Reporting of Child Abuse

UO employees, including faculty, staff, and GEs, are mandatory reporters of child abuse. This statement is to advise you that that your disclosure of information about child abuse to a UO employee may trigger the UO employee's duty to report that information to the designated authorities. Please refer to the following links for detailed information about mandatory reporting: https://hr.uoregon.edu/policies-leaves/general-information/mandatory-reporting-child-abuse-and-neglect/presidents-message