

POLI 3231 and POLI 5231
URBAN GOVERNANCE IN CANADA
Thursdays 4:05-6:55, WINTER 2013
Location: McCain 2162

Instructor: Dr. Tamara A. Krawchenko
Office: 360 Henry Hicks
Telephone: (902) 494-6626

E-mail: T.Krawchenko@dal.ca
Office Hours: Tues. & Thurs. 4-5 pm
or by appointment

COURSE THEMES AND OBJECTIVES

Canada is a highly urban country—our major political, economic, environmental, and social challenges *intersect* in cities. Urbanization impacts all levels of government. In this class, we pay particular attention to role of municipalities in governing this complexity.

Municipalities remain junior partners in Canadian federalism. They lack independent constitutional status and are limited in their legal, fiscal, and political autonomy. Academics and political and civil society leaders have begun to reconsider the importance of cities and municipal governments in their local, national, and international contexts. There is heightened advocacy to create new political, legislative, and fiscal relationships between municipalities and upper levels of government and to enhance the status of municipalities within Canadian federalism.

This course will provide students with the *analytical, theoretical, and methodological* tools to understand and explain the politics and policy activities of Canada's urban and suburban municipalities within their historical, institutional, and constitutional frameworks and within the political economy of cities. We will evaluate how *effectively* and *equitably* city governments in Canada have responded to contemporary urban challenges. In this class, we adopt a critical perspective on urban governance and engage with contemporary debates concerning municipal governance reform, the evolving nature of urban governance within Canadian federalism, and social science debates concerning how we ought to study cities.

** This course was created and is regularly taught by Dr. Kristin Good. It has been slightly modified due to copyright restrictions.*

FORMAT

The course will be offered in a seminar format. Some classes will include short “lectures” to set the context for discussion. Beginning on January 28, the second half of the class will consist of student presentations on case studies that are related to the week's topic.

TEXTBOOKS

Required

Sancton, Andrew. 2008. *The Limits of Boundaries: Why City-regions Cannot be Self-governing*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Optional (Recommended if you did not take POLI 2230. Students who took POLI 2230 should review the relevant chapters for the seminar):

Tindal, Richard C. and Susan Nobes Tindal. 2009. *Local Government in Canada* (7th edition). Scarborough, ON: Thomson Nelson Learning.

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

<i>Requirements</i>	<i>% of grade</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
Class participation	20%	n/a
Research paper proposal	5%	February 1 st , 2013
Research paper presentation	15%	Scheduled throughout
Research paper	40%	March 8 th , 2013
Book review	20%	April 5 th , 2013

Participation

The participation grade will be assigned on the basis of *attendance* and *active* participation in class. Surprise quizzes to test knowledge of the weekly readings and key concepts that will also count towards the participation grade. A good participant: offers his/her comments regularly, does not dominate the discussion, demonstrates knowledge of the assigned readings, and asks probing questions to his/her colleagues during the case study presentation sessions.

Research Paper Proposals (due February 1st, 2013)

This one-page, single-spaced (Times New Roman font) proposal will outline the topic/issue(s) to be researched. It will establish how the paper will *engage with* and *make use of* the scholarly literature on the topic and will outline the paper's structure and methods. The purpose of the proposal is for you to think about your topic early on and put together a thoughtful, structured and well-researched proposal.

Research Paper Presentations (scheduled throughout)

Students will present on the topic of their research papers. Presentations should outline the major thesis/argument of the paper, methods, literature and findings. The presentation should explain why the topic was chosen, why it is important and outline *how* the issue was explored. It should draw out the major issues and debates and include some class engagement. The presentation should be 15 minutes in length and make use of visuals (e.g., Power Point or Prezi). The deadline to submit your presentation is 4:00 p.m. the day before the presentation. At that time I will circulate the presentations to the class via the class listserv.

Research Papers (Due March 8th, 2013)

Research papers assess your ability to understand complex problems or issues, develop a perspective, and make a persuasive, logical, robust and well-researched argument. Research papers should be grounded the relevant literature and can make use of additional primary research. Papers often include: an introduction; a problem/thesis statement; a discussion of methods; a literature review; a description and evaluation of research findings; and a summary of the findings (but there can be variation). Research papers should be 12-15 pages in length for undergraduate students (POLI 3231) and 18-22 pages in length for graduate students (POLI 5231). Papers should be double-spaced, in 12 point, Time New Roman font with 1-inch margins.

Book review (Due April 5th, 2013)

To be discussed in class

Late penalties

Late research papers will be penalized by 5% per day (excluding weekends). If your assignment is late it can be submitted to the Department of Political Science office (301 Henry Hicks). Please have your paper dated and initialed should you submit it to the Department's main office. Missed case presentations and late book reviews will receive a grade of "O". Late penalties will be waived for exceptional reasons (such as medical and family emergencies) if the proper documentation is provided. If you know that your paper will be late for such a reason then please contact the instructor in advance.

**All students in this class are to read and understand the policies on plagiarism and academic honesty as referenced in the [Undergraduate Calendar](#). Ignorance of such policies is no excuse for violations.

COURSE AGENDA

Week 1 (January 11): Introduction: Why study city governance?

Questions for class discussion

- i. What is a local government?
- ii. What is a municipality? A municipal system?
- iii. What is a city?
- iv. What is the nature of the provincial-municipal relationship?
- v. Why is it important to study cities? Or, to put it in Caroline Andrew's (2001) words, why is it a "shame" to ignore the cities?

Required reading

Andrew, Caroline. 2001. The shame of (ignoring) the cities. *Journal of Canadian Studies*. 35, 4: 100-111.

Supplementary reading

Bradford, Neil. 2002. [Why Cities Matter: Policy Research Perspectives for Canada](#). CPRN Discussion Paper No. F23.

Week 2 (Jan 18): Why study city governance?: Theoretical, normative and methodological debates

Questions for class discussion

- i. How does "governance" differ from "government"? What is local/urban governance?
- ii. What is an "urban regime"?
- iii. What do municipalities do? What are their responsibilities/functions?
- iv. What factors affect municipal capacity and autonomy?
- v. In your view, do local politics and leadership matter?
- vi. What are some of the challenges facing Canada's municipalities and municipal systems?

Required readings

Tindal and Tindal – Chapter 2 and 11

Mossberger, Karen and Gerry Stoker. 2001. The evolution of urban regime theory: The challenge of conceptualization. *Urban Affairs Review* 36, 6 (July): 810-835.

Supplementary readings

Magnusson, Warren. 2005. Are municipalities creatures of the provinces? *Journal of Canadian Studies*. Spring, 39, 2.

Orr, Marion and Valerie C. Johnson eds. *Power in the city: Clarence Stone and the politics of inequality*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, pp. 76-107. Peterson, Paul E. 1981. *City Limits*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Pierre, Jon. 2005. Comparative urban governance: Uncovering complex causalities. *Urban Affairs Review* 40, 4, March.

Week 3 (Jan. 25): Urban governance, Canadian federalism and intergovernmental relations: Institutions and processes

Questions for class discussion

- i. In your view, does the federal government have a role to play in urban affairs? What incentives and disincentives does the federal government have to intervene in urban affairs in Canada?
- ii. When have urban affairs been on the federal government's agenda and 'why'?

- iii. What does it mean to say that urban affairs are on the federal government's agenda? How has the federal "machinery" varied in urban affairs over time?
- iv. What is "deep federalism"? Do you agree with Christopher Leo's argument? Is "deep federalism" a viable solution to the challenges of Canada's cities?
- v. What is the FCM and what is its role? (See Chenier and website above).
- vi. Chenier (2009) argues that the FCM needs to link municipal issues to federal policy priorities in order to be successful in its advocacy efforts. If you were being interviewed by the FCM for an internship in its secretariat, what kind of advice would you offer in terms of linking municipal issues to the current government's agenda? Can you think of examples of how the FCM has linked municipal issues to the federal government's agenda successfully?

Required readings

Tindal and Tindal – Chapter 6.

Smith, Patrick J. and Kennedy Stewart. 2005. Local whole-of-government policymaking in Vancouver: Beavers, cats, and the mushy middle thesis. In Robert Young and Christian Leuprecht eds. *Canada: The state of the federation 2004* (Chapter 11). Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Leo, Christopher. 2006. Deep federalism: Respecting community differences in national policy. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 39, 3: 481-506.

** I encourage you to take a look at the FCM's website at the following address:

<http://www.fcm.ca/>

Supplementary reading

Milroy, Beth Moore. 2002. Toronto's legal challenge to amalgamation. In Caroline Andrew, Katherine Graham and Susan Phillips. Eds. *Urban Affairs: Back on the policy agenda*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Berdahl, Loleen. 2006. The federal urban role and federal-municipal relations. In Robert Young and Christian Leuprecht eds. *Canada: The state of the federation 2004* (Chapter 2). Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Week 4 (Feb. 1): Municipal governance: Local leaders and decision-making processes

***** Paper Proposals Due *****

Questions for discussion

- i. What roles do mayors play as leaders of Canadian cities?
- ii. How powerful are Canadian mayors?
- iii. How does mayoral power compare with the power of leaders of upper levels of government? Mayors of the largest American cities? (See Feldman and Graham 2005).
- iv. How might a mayor increase his/her power in light of the position's formal weakness?
- v. What are the implications of 'weak mayor systems' for local democracy and governance?
- vi. Should mayors' formal role be strengthened? If so how and why? And, if not, why not?

Required readings

Tindal and Tindal – Chapter 8.

Sancton, Andrew. 1994. Mayors as political leaders. In Maureen Mancuson et al. eds. *Leaders and leadership in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, pp. 174-89.

Siegel, David. 1994. Politics, politicians, and public servants in non-partisan local governments. *Canadian Public Administration*. Spring, pp. 7-30.

Week 5: (Feb. 8): Governing city-regions: Recent reform debates

Questions for class discussion

- i. What is a municipal amalgamation?
- ii. What are the goals of municipal amalgamations?
- iii. To what extent did amalgamations in the 1990s and early 21st century achieve their objectives?
- iv. What caused municipal amalgamations according to Andrew Sancton? How convincingly does Sancton refute alternative explanations?
- v. What have been some of the unintended consequences of municipal amalgamations?
- vi. In your view, under what circumstances should municipalities amalgamate?

Required readings

Tindal and Tindal – Chapters 4 & 5

Sancton, Andrew. 2006. Why municipal amalgamations? Halifax, Toronto, Montreal. In Robert Young and Christian Leuprecht eds. Canada: The state of the federation 2004 (Chapter 5). Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Poel, Dale H. 2000. [Amalgamation perspectives: citizen responses to municipal consolidation](#). Canadian Journal of Regional Science. 23, 1: 31-48.

Supplementary reading

Bish, Robert L. 2001. Local Government Amalgamations: Discredited Nineteenth-Century Ideals Alive in the Twenty-First. C.D. Howe Institute Commentary. No. 150, March. Available online: <http://www.rbish.ca/>

Sancton, Andrew. 2000. Merger Mania: The assault on local government. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Week 6 (Feb. 15): Municipal finance: Fiscal balance?

Questions for class discussion

- i. What are Canadian municipalities' main sources of revenue?
- ii. According to Courchene (2007), Canadian municipalities' fiscal weakness is striking compared with other developed countries. How do Canadian municipalities compare with municipalities in other jurisdictions in the global north?
- iii. Courchene argues that GCRs must be more fully included in Canadian federalism. What does he have in mind?
- iv. Do municipalities' fiscal place in the intergovernmental system need to be reformed and, if so, how? (And, if not, then 'why not'?)

Required readings

Tindal and Tindal – Chapter 7

Courchene, Thomas J. 2007. [Global Futures for Canada's Global Cities](#). IRPP Policy Matters 8:2, June.

Slack, Enid. 2006. [Fiscal Balance: The Case for Cities. Institute on Municipal Finance and Governance](#), Munk Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto.

Supplementary reading

Slack, Enid. 2004. [Revenue Sharing Options for Canada's Hub Cities](#). A Report Prepared By Enid Slack Consulting Inc.

Week 7 (Feb. 22): Municipalities and the public: Elections, representation, and public participation

Questions for class discussion

- i. How might one measure what constitutes a “healthy democracy”? Are municipal democracies healthy?
- ii. What is the purpose of elections? Why are they important?
- iii. What factors influence voter turn-out at the local level? How do these factors differ from those that influence voter turn-out at the federal level? (See Kushner and Siegel 2006).
- iv. Should municipal electoral financing be regulated? And, if so, how? What are the various types of regulation and what are their rationales?
- v. What does Young and Austin (2008)'s comparative analysis of election finance regulations in Toronto and Calgary suggest about the impact of such regulations on local democratic processes?
- vi. Would extending the municipal franchise to immigrants and youth enhance the quality of local democracy?
- vii. More generally, what (if anything) ought to be done to strengthen local democracies in Canada?

Required readings

Tindal and Tindal – Chapter 10

Kushner, Joseph. 2006. Why do municipal electors not vote? *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*. Volume 15, Issue 2, pp. 264-277.

Young, Lisa and Sam Austin. 2008. Political finance in city elections: Toronto and Calgary compared. *The Canadian Political Science Review*. 2, 3: 88-102.

Siemiatycki, Myer. 2006. [The municipal franchise and social inclusion in Toronto: Policy and practice](#). Inclusive Cities Canada.

Supplementary reading

Hicks, Bruce M. 2006. [Are Marginalized Communities Disenfranchised? Voter Turnout and Representation in Post-Merger Toronto](#). IRPP Working Paper Series, no. 2006-03. November. FCM Report - [Increasing Women's Participation in Municipal Decision-Making: Strategies for More Inclusive Canadian Communities](#).

Note: Feb. 25-March 1: STUDY BREAK—NO CLASSES

Week 8 (March 8): The politics of urban growth and development I: Cities as “Growth Machines”

***** Research Papers Due*****

Questions for class discussion

- i. What is a “growth machine”? (See Molotch 1976 and Good 2009, Chapter 2).
- ii. Who are the central actors in growth machines? Why do so many elements of communities support the goal of growth above all else?
- iii. Which actors/interests might be anti-growth and challenge local ‘growth machines’?
- iv. Why should one be “realistic about urban growth” in Leo and Anderson’s view? What does this entail in the Canadian context?

Required readings

Logan, John R. and Harvey L. Molotch. 2002. The city as growth machine. In Susan Fainstein and Scott Campbell eds. *Readings in urban theory*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Leo, Christopher and Kathryn Anderson. 2006. Being realistic about urban growth. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 28, 2: 169-189.

Florida, Richard. 2005. *Cities and the creative class*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 27-45.

Supplementary reading

- Logan, John R. et. al. 1999. The Character and Consequences of Growth Regimes: An Assessment of Twenty Years of Research. In *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* edited by Andrew E. G. Jonas and David Wilson. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- ShiftCentral Inc. 2003. [Are We Urban? The Urban Growth Agenda in the Atlantic Canadian Context](#). Prepared for the Greater Halifax Partnership, September 9.
- FCM. 2007. [The Big City Mayors National Transit Strategy](#), March 5, 2007.

Week 9 (March 15): The politics of urban growth and development II: Global and World Cities

Questions for class discussion

- i. What do Kipfer and Keil (2002) mean by the “competitive city”? What has Toronto’s shift toward a “competitive city” or “Toronto inc” involved in their view?
- ii. Is there any evidence that Halifax or other Canadian cities have become “competitive cities” as Kipfer and Keil conceptualize them? Does Good’s (2009) analysis support Keil and Kipfer’s?
- iii. What is a “world city”? How do scholars identify them? What do Benton-Short, Price and Friedman argue is missing from existing conceptualizations?
- iv. Is Canada experiencing a “rescaling” of political power?

Required readings

- Kipfer, Stefan and Roger Keil. 2002. Toronto Inc? Planning the competitive city in the new Toronto. *Antipode*. March pp. 227-264.
- Bunting, Trudi and Tod Rutherford. 2006. Transitions in an Era of Globalization and City Growth. In Trudi Bunting and Pierre Filion (eds). *Canada cities in transition: local through global perspectives*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- Benton-Short, Lisa, Marie D. Price and Samantha Friedman. 2005. Globalization from Below: The ranking of global immigrant cities. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29: 4, 945-959.

Supplementary readings

- Andrew, Caroline and Patrick J. Smith. 1999. World-class Cities: Can or should Canada play? In Caroline Andrew, Pat Armstrong and Andre Lapierre eds. *World Class Cities: Can Canada Play?* Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, pp. 7-23.
- Brenner, Neil. 2005. *New State Spaces: Urban governance and the rescaling of statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Magnusson, Warren. 1996. *The Search for Political Space: Globalization, Social Movements, and the Urban Political Experience*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Week 10 (March 22): Urban autonomy movements: Toward a new status for urban municipalities?

Question for class discussion

- Should urban municipalities be empowered in the Canadian governmental system? If so, ‘why’ and ‘how’? If not, why? Do you agree or disagree with Andrew Sancton’s argument? Why?

Required reading

- Sancton, Andrew. 2008. *The Limits of Boundaries*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press.

Supplementary reading

Ideas that matter. 2005. [Toward a New City of Toronto Act](#).

Note: March 29, 2013, Good Friday, UNIVERSITY CLOSED

Week 11 (April 5): Strengthening local democracy: A round table discussion

*****Book Review Due*****

GRADING SCALE AND RUBRICS

Grading scale			
Ltr. Grd.	% Grd.	GPV	Definition
A+	90-100	4.30	Excellent: Considerable evidence of original thinking; demonstrated outstanding capacity to analyze and synthesize; outstanding grasp of subject matter; evidence of extensive knowledge base.
A	85-89	4.00	
A-	80-84	3.70	
B+	77-79	3.30	Good: Evidence of grasp of subject matter, some evidence of critical capacity and analytical ability; reasonable understanding of relevant issues; evidence of familiarity with the literature.
B	73-76	3.00	
B-	70-72	2.70	
C+	67-69	2.30	Satisfactory: Evidence of some understanding of the subject matter; ability to develop solutions to simple problems; benefitting from his/her university experience.
C	63-66	2.00	
C-	60-62	1.70	
D	50-59	1.00	Marginal Pass: Evidence of minimally acceptable familiarity with subject matter, critical and analytical skills (except in programs where a minimum grade of 'C' is required).
F	0-49	0.00	Insufficient evidence of understanding of the subject matter; weakness in critical and analytical skills; limited or irrelevant use of the literature.

Grading rubric for book review _____/20				
	100-80% (A+ to A-)	79-70% (B+ to B-)	69-60% (C+ to C-)	59 and less% (D & F)
Summary _____/10	Strong thesis, demonstrating insight and independent thought. Succinct analysis of author's core argument with demonstration through supporting points/quotes.	Clearly-stated thesis, forecasting book review's organisation. Some relevant quotations of author's argument Most of book summarized, sometimes related to thesis. Discusses argument, but excess/not enough detail.	Vague or unclear thesis. Few relevant quotations of author's argument. Some summary. Thesis neglected. Neglects argument, excess/not enough detail.	Missing, invalid, or inappropriate thesis. Little or no summary, thesis ignored. Focus on details and not on the author's argument.
Critical analysis _____/10	Thorough development of major ideas, strong grounding in the literature. Describes and analyses how author's argument is constructed. Provides pertinent examples of author's use of evidence including examples of logic, bias, and plausibility.	Concrete support for each major point; adequate grounding in the literature. Provides some examples of author's use of evidence Discusses author's effectiveness with some examples of logic, bias, and plausibility	Illogical or incomplete development of ideas; poor grounding in the literature. Asserts author's effectiveness with few examples.	Insufficient, vague, or illogical support; extremely weak grounding in the literature. No discussion of author's sources; use of evidence or effectiveness,
Organi- sation _____/5	Logical arrangement of supporting points in coherent paragraphs; effective transitions.	Acceptable arrangement of ideas; satisfactory paragraph construction; adequate transitions.	Confusing arrangement of ideas; unclear paragraph construction; weak transitions.	No discernible pattern of organization; unfocused paragraphs; coherence problems.
Style and mechanics _____/5	Appropriate tone; clear sentences and structure; strong, jargon-free diction. Few to no errors in usage, spelling, and punctuation.	Appropriate tone; clear sentences; effective diction. No major errors in usage, spelling, or punctuation.	Inappropriate tone; little variety or emphasis in sentence structures; vague diction, imprecise word choices. Distracting errors in usage, spelling, or punctuation.	Inconsistent tone; awkward/ unclear sentences; weak diction. Many or major errors in usage, spelling, or punctuation.

Grading rubric for research paper _____ /40				
	100-80% (A+ to A-)	79-70% (B+ to B-)	69-60% (C+ to C-)	59 and less% (D & F)
Introduction ____/5	Strong introduction of topic's key question(s), terms. Clearly delineates subtopics to be reviewed. Specific thesis statement.	Conveys topic and key question(s). Clearly delineates subtopics to be reviewed. General thesis statement.	Conveys topic, but not key question(s). Describes subtopics to be reviewed. General thesis statement.	Does not adequately convey topic. Does not describe subtopics to be reviewed. Lacks adequate thesis statement.
Focus and sequencing ____/10	All material clearly related to subtopic, main topic. Strong organization and integration of material within subtopics. Strong transitions linking subtopics, and main topic.	All material clearly related to subtopic, main topic and logically organized within subtopics. Clear, varied transitions linking subtopics, and main topic.	Most material clearly related to subtopic, main topic. Material may not be organized within subtopics. Attempts to provide variety of transitions.	Little evidence material is logically organized into topic, subtopics or related to topic. Many transitions are unclear or nonexistent.
Literature and methods ____/10	Strong peer-reviewed research based support for thesis. Methods strong.	Sources well selected to support thesis with some research in support of thesis. Methods adequate.	Sources generally acceptable but not peer-reviewed research (evidence) based. Methods weak/unclear.	Few sources supporting thesis. Sources insignificant or unsubstantiated. Methods not evident.
Conclusion ____/5	Strong review of key conclusions. Strong integration with thesis statement. Insightful discussion of impact of the researched material on topic.	Strong review of key conclusions. Strong integration with thesis statement. Discusses impact of researched material on topic.	Review of key conclusions. Some integration with thesis statement. Discusses impact of researched material on topic.	Does not summarize evidence with respect to thesis statement. Does not discuss the impact of researched material on topic
Grammar and mechanics ____/5	The paper is free of grammatical errors and spelling & punctuation.	Grammatical errors or spelling & punctuation are rare and do not detract from the paper.	Very few grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors interfere with reading the paper.	Grammatical errors or spelling & punctuation substantially detract from the paper.
Style and communication ____/5	No errors in citation style. Scholarly style. Writing is flowing and easy to follow.	Rare errors in citation style that do not detract from the paper. Scholarly style. Writing has minimal awkward or unclear passages.	Errors in citation style are noticeable. Word choice occasionally informal in tone. Writing has a few awkward or unclear passages.	Errors in citation style detract substantially from the paper. Word choice is informal in tone. Writing is choppy, with many awkward or unclear passages.

Grading rubric for presentation: / 15				
	100-80%	79-70%	69-60%	59-49%
Argument/ thesis ____/4	Strong argument/thesis, demonstrating insight and independent thought. Clear structure/organisation.	Clearly-stated argument/thesis, forecasting presentation's organisation.	Vague or unclear argument/thesis.	Missing, invalid, or inappropriate argument/thesis.
Content/Ideas ____/4	Thorough development of major ideas, strong grounding in core concepts or analytical framework.	Concrete support for major points; adequate grounding in core concepts or analytical framework.	Illogical or incomplete development of ideas; poor grounding in concepts or analytical framework.	Insufficient, vague, or illogical support; extremely weak grounding core concepts or analytical framework.
Style/ Organisation ____/4	Logical arrangement of supporting points; Effective transitions.	Acceptable arrangement of ideas; Satisfactory construction; Adequate transitions.	Confusing arrangement of ideas; Unclear construction; Weak transitions.	No discernible pattern of organization; Unfocused. Coherence problems.
Presentation resources/mat erials (e.g., literature, data, media) and student engagement ____/3	Well-incorporated and thoughtful selection of material to support argument. Thoughtful student engagement.	Appropriate selection and use of supporting materials. Some student engagement.	Weak incorporation and selection of supporting materials. Weak student engagement.	Inappropriate and inadequate use and selection of supporting materials. No efforts at student engagement.

ACADEMIC RULES AND REGULATIONS

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

All students in this class are to read and understand the policies on academic integrity and plagiarism referenced in the Policies and Student Resources sections of the academicintegrity.dal.ca website. Ignorance of such policies is no excuse for violations.

Any paper submitted by a student at Dalhousie University may be checked for originality to confirm that the student has not plagiarized from other sources. Plagiarism is considered a serious academic offence which may lead to loss of credit, suspension or expulsion from the University, or even to the revocation of a degree. It is essential that there be correct attribution of authorities from which facts and opinions have been derived. At Dalhousie there are University Regulations which deal with plagiarism and, prior to submitting any paper in a course, students should read the Policy on Intellectual Honesty contained in the Calendar or on the Online Dalhousie website. The Senate has affirmed the right of any instructor to require that student papers be submitted in both written and computer-readable format, and to submit any paper to be checked electronically for originality.

DALHOUSIE REGULATIONS

- From the University Calendar: "Students are expected to complete class work by the prescribed deadlines. Only in special circumstances ... may an instructor extend such deadlines."
- Late papers will be assessed a late penalty at the instructor's discretion. Students who miss a deadline on account of illness are expected to hand in the assignment within one week of their return to class, with a medical certificate, per academic regulations of the Dalhousie Calendar.
- Papers should be submitted directly to the instructor, or the teaching assistant, or in person to the Political Science office between 8:30 am and 4:30 pm on weekdays only. The instructor cannot assume responsibility for papers otherwise submitted.
- The final exam is scheduled by the Registrar's office. Make **no travel plans** until you know the date of the exam. Students who think they are obliged to be absent from an examination for some profoundly compelling reason need to elaborate that reason in the form of a letter to the chair of the department of Political Science well in advance of the scheduled exam, and the chair will render a decision on the matter.
- For Winter-term classes, the deadline by which a student may withdraw is March 8th. (Early deadline: February 1st.)

REQUEST FOR ACCOMMODATION

Students may request accommodation as a result of barriers related to disability, religious obligation, or any characteristic under the Nova Scotia Human Rights Act. Students who require academic accommodation for either classroom participation or the writing of tests and exams should make their request to the Advising and Access Services Center (AASC) prior to or at the outset of the regular academic year. Please visit www.dal.ca/access for more information and to obtain the Request for Accommodation – Form A. A note taker may be required as part of a student's accommodation. There is an honorarium of \$75/course/term (with some exceptions). If you are interested, please contact AASC at 494-2836 for more information.