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Course Overview

In this course we examine theoretical and methodological approaches to understanding policymaking and the processes by which policies are (and are not) translated into practice. Our overarching goals for the course are to help you to be able to a) critique current and future policies influencing your problem of practice, b) determine likely outcomes, especially as they relate to equity and social justice, resulting from policies as they are written, and c) implement or modify policies in your place of practice, as necessary, to achieve valued outcomes.

In order to effectively understand and evaluate policies we must establish some common understandings. In this course we consider policies broadly (i.e., both formal and informal) as “a definite course or method of action selected from among alternatives and in light of given conditions to guide and determine present and future decisions” (Merriam-Webster Dictionary: 2a). Therefore, we assume the following features of policies: 1) there is intention to act; 2) there is a problem being addressed – the problem motivates the intention to act; 3) there is a goal in mind which necessitates measuring outcomes aligned with that goal; 4) there is always either an explicit or implied theory of change – the theory of action helps transform abstract language into assumed causal pathways for how actions will produce outcomes; and 5) the study and critique of policy is the study of change. Policy analysis, therefore, is an informed argument of the likelihood that desired outcomes will be achieved given all of the “If-Then” propositions elucidated in the theory of change, as well as judgments about what we know about policy implementation from prior policy studies within and across disciplines.

Over the course we will delve into various challenges that policies typically face during implementation. For example, we find the social sciences, and education, in particular to provide interesting case studies for policy implementation because: 1) outcomes are often either vague, highly contested, or so abstract they are not easily measured; 2) different practitioners hold fundamentally different goals (e.g., what it means to have “learned” content in a discipline); 3) theories about change and, in particular, mechanisms for change are often ill-defined and not empirically verified; 4) when there are intense demands on practitioners – it is hard to anticipate how policies influence their decisions; and 5) the more difficult it is to measure outcomes, there is equal difficulty evaluating and improving upon policy implementation.

**Course Essential Questions (EQ)**

1. What is educational policy?
2. What should be the aims of educational policy? What can/can't policy do?
3. How do values shape how people understand the goals and approaches to educational**\*** policy more broadly? For example, what is “educational equity” and how does our understanding of the concept shape our view of policies with a goal of equity?
4. What are fundamental tensions that exist in policies? How can/should those tensions be addressed by different stakeholders? What assumptions about teacher learning are embedded in policies that aim to improve educational outcomes?
5. What assumptions about teacher learning are embedded in policies that aim to improve educational outcomes?
6. How can educational policy be improved?

Because this is a mandatory course across a diverse set of ARCOs, some students may choose to focus on non-educational policies. We encourage this. Although the majority of readings are from education, our goals for the course and the essential questions are broader than the field of education. We believe that the principles learned through the study of educational policy can be applied more broadly to other social policies. We welcome suggestions for course readings outside of K-16 education policy.

**Course Goals**

**Skills:**

* Synthesize concepts and understandings across readings, topics, and contexts
* Think analytically about readings and course concepts to make thoughtful and constructive critiques
* Collaborate on ideas and compositions with peers
* Improve argument development, organization, and ability to communicate ideas in different genres of writing
* Develop ideas regarding how leaders can broker policies and/or buffer their organizations from policies

**Understandings:**

* Identify and understand the use of traditional policy concepts (e.g. policy instruments, theory of action)
* Analyze and evaluate educational policies as value-laden (rather than value-neutral), and examine how competing values create tensions in policy goals, design, and implementation
* Identify and understand how policies have intended and unintended consequences
* Identify and discuss different purposes, assumptions, values, and goals of different policies and policy analysis frames
* Learn how to navigate tensions introduced by policies surrounding your problem of practice

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement** | | **Due Date** |
| Attend all synchronous sessions | | May 15  June 5  July 10  July 31 |
| Participation | Introduction on FlipGrid | May 13 |
| Venn Diagram | May 14 |
| Policy Matrix | May 28 |
| Double-Entry Journals (4) | **#1** June 9  **#2** June 16  **#3** June 23  **#4** July 7 |
| Worksheet: Purpose of Education | May 21 |
| Worksheet: Organizational Leader | July 16 |
| Theory of Action | June 3 |
| Policy Implementation Analysis | | July 1 |
| Synthesize peer responses for double-entry journals (only 1) | | **#1** June 12  **#2** June 19  **#3 *July 3***  **#4** July 10 |
| Poster | | July 22 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Readings & Assignments** |
| **Week 1**  **May 10**  (EQ3) | Topic: **Tensions in the Purposes of Education**  Required:  Douglass, F. (2014/1845). In *Narrative of the life of Frederick Douglass, an American slave.* Minneapolis, MN: Lerner Publishing Group.  Chapter VII: Learning to read and write.  Perlstein, D. (1990). Teaching freedom: SNCC and the creation of the  Mississippi freedom schools. *History of Education Quarterly, 30*(3), 297–324.  Brown, C. (2018, August 27). She never saw a classroom until college. Now she has a Ph.D. and a lot of thoughts about education. *Forbes.*  <https://www.forbes.com/sites/catherinebrown/2018/08/27/she-never-saw-a-classroom-until-college-now-she-has-a-ph-d-and-a-lot-of-thoughts-about-education/#6a82f65d2787>  Preview slides about “*What is policy?”* and think about policy in relation to your problem of practice.  Supplemental:  Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the*  *politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.  Du Bois, W.E.B. (2003/1903). “Of the coming of John.” In *The souls of black folk*. New York, NY: Modern Library Edition.  Bear, C. (2008, May 19). “American Indian Boarding Schools Haunt Many.”  NPR. <https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=16516865>  Assignments:  **(1)** Make a short (1-2 minute) flipgrid video with an introduction to yourself (mostly for your instructors). Please include information about your professional background, one or two “fun facts” you wish to share (see below), and a brief description of your problem of practice. Fun fact suggested topics: What’s one of your favorite foods? What’s your favorite trip/vacation? What TV show, movie, book, or music would you recommend? What is one of your hobbies?  <https://flipgrid.com/educ3005>  **(2)** Make a Venn Diagram of (1) what it means to be ‘educated’ and the process of ‘education’ (what it means to seek knowledge and understanding of the disciplines and the real world); (2) what it means to be ‘schooled’ and participate in the process of ‘schooling’ (what it means to participate in the social process of attending school); and (3) where those two intersect (where knowledge and schooling coincide). Using this week’s readings reflect on the purposes and assumptions of education/schooling and infer what you think each process assumes the primary aims of education are (in theory and in reality). Submit your Venn Diagram prior to class on Canvas. Bring your Venn Diagram to your Zoom discussion on May 16 where we will discuss and co-construct a Venn Diagram with your peers. |
| **May 15** | **First Synchronous Session**  You will be assigned to a 1-hour Zoom session with your instructors and one-third of your peers; you will also attend a whole-class Zoom session at 11:00 am.  In the first session, we will discuss the prior week’s readings and the assignment about the purpose of education in relation to the Venn diagram students prepared.  For both sessions, we will begin with a whole-group discussion for the first half-hour followed by a small-group discussion for the second half-hour.  **Session (1) 8:00 – 9:00 am**  **Session (2) 9:00 – 10:00 am**  **Session (3) 10:00 – 11:00 am**  **Session (4) 11:00 – 12:00 pm All students**  In the second Zoom session we will discuss the general layout of the course and syllabus.Having briefly previewed the class material and readings for the upcoming weeks, we will provide you the opportunity to ask questions about the syllabus and preview how we will connect tensions in the purposes of education with policy. |
| **Week 2**  **May 17**  (EQ2, EQ3) | Topic: **Goals of Education**  Required:  Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(1), 39–81.  Supplemental:  Basile, V., & Lopez E. (2015). And still I see no changes: Enduring views of students of color in science and mathematics education policy reports. *Science Education*, 99(3), 519–548.  Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging power and privilege: A critical race analysis of university diversity policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *43*(5), 586–611.    Assignment:  Worksheet: Purpose of Education (see Canvas for instructions and the template) to be submitted by May 22. |
| **Week 3**  **May 24**  (EQ1, EQ2) | Topic: **What is Policy?**  Required:  Torjman, S. (2005). *What is policy?* Ottawa, Canada: Caledon Institute of Social Policy.  Instructor Notes about the definition of policy and why the field of education provides a good opportunity to reflect on the challenge of policy design and policy implementation.  Supplemental:  Fowler, F.C. (2013). *Policy studies for educational leaders*. Boston: Pearson. Chapter 1: Policy: What it is and where it comes from.  Hillman, N. W., Tandberg, D. A., & Sponsler, B. A. (2015). Public policy and higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 41*(2), 1–20.  Woolf, S. H., & Braveman, P. (2011). Where health disparities begin: the role of social and economic determinants—and why current policies may make matters worse. *Health affairs, 30*(10), 1852–1859.  Assignment:  Policy Matrix(see Canvas for instructions and the template) to be submitted by May 29. |
| **Week 4**  **May 31**  (EQ2, EQ4, & EQ5) | Topic: **Theory of Action (ToA)**  Required:  Malen, B., Croninger, R., Muncey, D., & Redmond–Jones, D. (2002). Reconstituting schools: “Testing” the “theory of action”. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, *24*(2), 113–132.  Theory of Action Handout  Supplemental:  Stecher, B., Hamilton, L. S., & Gonzalez, G. (2003). *Working smarter to leave no child behind*. Rand Corporation.  Elmore, R. F. (1979). Backward mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions. *Political science quarterly*, *94*(4), 601–616.  Tellings, Agnes (2011). Theories and research in the field of education: An indissoluble union (pp.9–14), in *The role of theory in education* (Norwegian Education Research Towards 2020). Retrieved from Research Council of Norway, <https://www.forskningsradet.no/siteassets/publikasjoner/1253979441594.pdf>  Tinto, V., & Pusser, B. (2006). Moving from theory to action: Building a model of institutional action for student success. *National Postsecondary Education Cooperative*, 1–51.  Assignment:  Theory of Action (see Canvas for instructions, template, and example) to be submitted by June 4:  Create a Theory of Action (ToA) table or diagram for your problem of practice and related policy. A ToA (a) shows a causal pathway from policy (or program) intentions to outcomes along with (b) the intermediate steps that connect policy intention to outcomes and (c) surfaces underlying assumptions regarding how one step leads to the next.  We provide the example of an assumed theory-of-action from the Malen et al., (2002) reading for this week. |
| **June 5** | **Second Synchronous Session**  We will begin with a whole group check-in and a description of the morning activities. Starting at 8:30 we will break into our small groups to explore and discuss the concept of theory-of-action. In small groups, you will rotate through 3 one-hour sessions in which you will:   * Discuss your ToA table/diagram with your peers and an instructor. * Together with your small group colleagues critique a theory-of-action diagram for the policy of standards-based reform (post work on Canvas white board) * Critique your own ToA either independently or with a small-group colleague(s).   We will close with a whole group summary, a brief introduction to the next set of readings and a Question & Answer session. |
| **Week 5**  **June 7**  (EQ2, EQ4, & EQ6) | Topic: **Introduction to Policy Implementation**  Required:  Dumas, M. J., & Anyon, J. (2006). Toward a critical approach to education policy implementation. *New directions in education policy implementation*, 149–168.  Preview slides about “*Introduction to Policy Implementation*.”  Supplemental:  McLaughlin, M. W. (1987). Learning from experience: Lessons from policy implementation. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis,* *9*(2), 171–178.  Lindblom, C. E. (1959) The science of “muddling through” *Public Administration Review*, *19*(2), 79–88.  Fowler, F. C. (2013). *Policy Studies for Educational Leaders*. Boston: Pearson. Chapter 10 Policy Implementation: Getting People to Carry Out a Policy**.**  Harries, C., Koprak, J., Young, C., Weiss, S., Parker, K. M., & Karpyn, A. (2014). Moving from policy to implementation: a methodology and lessons learned to determine eligibility for Healthy Food Financing Projects. J*ournal of Public Health Management and Practice, 20*(5), 498.  Assignment:  Double Entry Journal #1 (see Canvas for instructions and template) to be submitted by June 10. |
| **Week 6**  **June 14**  (EQ2, EQ4, & EQ5) | Topic: **Policy Levers**  Required:  McDonnell, L.M., & Elmore, R. F. (1987). Getting the job done: Alternative policy instruments. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 9*(2), 133–152.  Felix, E. R., & Castro, M. F. (2018). Planning as strategy for Improving black and latinx student equity: Lessons from Nine California Community Colleges. *Education Policy Analysis Achieves*, 26(56), 1–33.  Supplemental:  Fowler, F.C. (2013). *Policy studies for educational leaders*. Boston: Pearson. Chapter 9: Looking at Policies: Policies Instruments and Cost Effectiveness  Ness, E.C., Mistretta, M.A. (2009). Policy adoption in North Carolina and Tennessee: A comparative case study of lottery beneficiaries. *The Review of Higher Education*, *32*(4), 489–514.  Deber, R. B. (2014). Thinking about accountability. *Healthcare Policy, 10*(SP), 12.  Assignment:  Double Entry Journal #2 (see Canvas for instructions and template) to be submitted by June 17. |
| **Week 7**  **June 21**  (EQ2, EQ3, & EQ4) | Topic: **Practitioners as Agents in Reform Policy Implementation**  Required:  Weatherley, R., & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street-level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: Implementing special-education reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*(2), 171–197.  Supplemental:  Cohen, D. K. (1990). A revolution in one classroom: The case of Mrs. Oublier. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *12*(3), 311–329.  Hurtado, S. (2015). The transformative paradigm: Principles and challenges. In A. M. Martinez–Aleman, Pusser, B., & Bensimon, E. (Eds.), *Critical Approaches to the Study of Higher Education: An Introduction* (pp. 284–307), Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press.  Gilson, L. (2016). Everyday politics and the leadership of health policy implementation. *Health Systems and Reform*, *2*(3), 187–193.  Assignment:  Double-entry journal #3 (see Canvas for instructions and template) to be submitted by June 24. |
| **Week 8**  **June 8**  (EQ2, EQ3) | Topic: **Unintended Effects of Policy**  Required:  Loveless, T. (2008). *The misplaced math student: Lost in eighth-grade algebra. The 2008 Brown Center report on American education. Special release.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.  Perry, A. (2006). Toward a theoretical framework for membership: The case of undocumented immigrants and financial aid for postsecondary education. *Review of Higher Education, 30*(21), p. 21–40.  Supplemental:  Teranishi R. T., & Bezbatchenko A. W. (2015). A critical examination of the college completion agenda: Advancing equity in higher education In A. M. Martinez–Aleman, Pusser, B., & Bensimon, E. (Eds.), *Critical Approaches to the Study of Higher Education: An Introduction* (pp. 241–256), Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press.  Vest, J. R., & Kash, B. A. (2016). Differing strategies to meet information‐sharing needs: Publicly supported community health information exchanges versus health systems’ enterprise health information exchanges. *The Milbank Quarterly, 94*(1), 77–108.  Dawson, E. (2014). Equity in informal science education: Developing an access and equity framework for science museums and science centres. *Studies in Science Education, 50*(2), 209–247.  Assignment:  Policy Implementation Analysis Worksheet (see Canvas for instructions and template) to be submitted by July 3. |
| **Week 9**  **July 5**  (EQ3, EQ4, & EQ6) | Topic: **Building Organizational Capacity**  Required:  Beaver, J. K., & Weinbaum, E. H. (2012). Measuring school capacity, maximizing school improvement. *CPRE Policy Briefs RB*, *53*.  Iverson, S. V. (2007). Camouflaging power and privilege: A critical race analysis of university diversity policies. *Education Administration Quarterly, 43*(5), 586–611.  Supplemental:  Honig, M. I., & Hatch, T. C. (2004). Crafting coherence: How schools strategically manage multiple, external demands. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(8), 16–30.  Lane, J. E. (2012) Agency theory in higher education organizations. In M. Bastedo (Ed.), The Organization of Higher Education: Managing Colleges for a New Era (pp. 278–303), Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press.  Merisotis, J. P., & Phipps R. A. (2000). Remedial education in colleges and universities: What is really going on? *The Review of Higher Education, 24(*1), 67–85.  Mahoney, J. L., & Zigler, E. F. (2006). Translating science to policy under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001: Lessons from the national evaluation of the 21st-Century Community Learning Centers. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 27*(4), 282–294.  Assignment:  Double-entry journal #4 (see Canvas for instructions and template) to be submitted by July 8. |
| **July 11** | **Third Synchronous Session**  Each instructor provides a brief overview of a “well-known” educational policy; students will be asked to analyze what worked and what didn’t work and to use concepts from the course thus far to “explain” what happened and why.  What could leaders have done differently to produce better outcomes? Focus on agency individuals have within their given context.  Time breakouts:   * 8:00 – 8:30 Intro * 8:30 – 9:30 Work in 9 groups of 7. * 9:30 – 10:00 Meet in groups of 21 to prepare “poster” * 10:00 –11:30 Whole Group (30 minutes for each one-third subgroup to present and field questions) * 11:30 – noon Wrap Up. |
| **Week 10**  **July 13**  (EQ4, EQ6) | Topic: **How Leaders Strategically Manage Policies**  Required:  LeChasseur, K., Donaldson, M., Fernandez, E., & Femc-Bagwell, M. (2018). Brokering, buffering, and the rationalities of principal work. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *56*(3), 262–276.  Supplemental:  Mintrop, H. (2012). Bridging accountability obligations, professional values and (perceived) student needs with integrity, *Journal of Educational Administration*, *50*(5), 695–726. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231211249871>  Rutledge, S. A., Harris, D. N., & Ingle, W. K. (2010). How principals “bridge and buffer” the new demands of teacher quality and accountability: A mixed-methods analysis of teacher hiring. *American Journal of Education*, *116*(2), 211–242.  Allen, D., & Roegman, R., and Hatch, T. (2016). Investigating discourses for administrators’ learning within instructional rounds. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, *44*(5), 837–852.  Farris, D. (2018). Organisational citizenship behaviour in university administrative committees. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 40*(3), 224–238.  Chinitz, D. P., & Rodwin, V. G. (2014). On health policy and management (HPAM): Mind the theory-policy-practice gap*. International journal of health policy and management, 3*(7), 361–363.  Assignment:  Organizational Leader Worksheet (see Canvas for instructions, template, and example) to be submitted by July 17. |
| **Week 11**  **July 20**  (EQ3, EQ4, EQ5, & EQ6) | Topic: **Navigating the Tensions**  Required:  Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: a.k.a. The remix. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), p. 74–84.  Howe, E., & Correnti, R. (2020) Negotiating the political and pedagogical tensions of writing rubrics: Using conceptualization to work toward sociocultural writing instruction. *English Education* (In press).  **Maps to Explore:**   * [Mapping Inequality: Redlining in New Deal America](https://dsl.richmond.edu/panorama/redlining/#loc=11/40.442/-79.986&city=pittsburgh-pa) - University of Richmond’s Digital Scholarship Lab * [The Opportunity Atlas](https://www.opportunityatlas.org/) - Harvard’s Opportunity Insights team   Semuels, Alana. (2016, August 25). [Good School, Rich School; Bad School, Poor School](https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/08/property-taxes-and-unequal-schools/497333/). *The Atlantic.*  Hannah-Jones, Nikole. (2014, December 19). [School Segregation and the](https://www.propublica.org/article/ferguson-school-segregation)  [Continuing Tragedy of Ferguson](https://www.propublica.org/article/ferguson-school-segregation). *Pro Publica*.  Supplemental:  Diem, S., Young, M. D., & Sampson, C. (2019). Where critical policy analysis meets the politics of education: An introduction. *Educational Policy, 30*(1), p. 3–15.  Assignment:  Poster (see Canvas for instructions) to be submitted by July 28. |
| **July 31** | **Final Synchronous Meeting**  Virtual Poster Session |

**Course Policies**

**Attendance**

Your active participation is necessary both for your own learning and that of others. Therefore, students are expected to attend all Saturday class sessions, join Zoom meetings on time, and be prepared to participate in meaningful and respectful ways. This course meets only four times throughout the term and missing one of those sessions constitutes a significant portion of the online interaction with instructors and peers, and thus counts against points that you will receive for participation.

Although students are expected to attend all Saturday class sessions, working professionals sometimes find themselves in circumstances that cause them to miss these class meetings. Exceptions to the attendance policy may be made for a **required** **work-related commitment, illness, or an emergency only. All other absences are not considered excused**. In excused cases, students are required to submit a one-page (single spaced) summary of the preceding week’s common reading and one selected reading on or before the date of the missed class.

**Academic Integrity**

Students in this course will be expected to comply with the [University of Pittsburgh's Policy on Academic Integrity](http://www.cfo.pitt.edu/policies/policy/02/02-03-02.html). Cheating/plagiarism will not be tolerated. Students suspected of violating the University of Pittsburgh Policy on Academic Integrity, from the February 1974 Senate Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom reported to the Senate Council, will be required to participate in the outlined procedural process as initiated by the instructor.

**Classroom Recording**

To ensure the free and open discussion of ideas, students may not record classroom lectures, discussion, and/or activities without the advance written permission of the instructor, and any such recording properly approved in advance can be used solely for the student’s own private use.

**Disability/Special Needs**

If you require special circumstances to enable your participation in the course, please let us know as soon as possible. According to Pitt policy, if you have a disability that requires special testing accommodations or other classroom modifications, you need to notify both the instructor and the Disability Resources and Services no later than the 2nd week of the term. You may be asked to provide documentation of your disability to determine the appropriateness of accommodations. To notify Disability Resources and Services, call 648-7890 (Voice or TTD) to schedule an appointment. The Office is located in 216 William Pitt Union.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grade | Percentage |
| A+ | 97–100 |
| A | 94–96 |
| A- | 90–93 |
| B+ | 87–89 |
| B | 84–86 |
| B- | 80–83 |
| C+ | 77–79 |
| C | 74–76 |
| C- | 70–73 |
| D+ | 67–69 |
| D | 64–66 |
| D- | 60–63 |
| F | < 60 |

**Grading**

60% on participation

20% on policy implementation analysis

10% on synthesis of peer responses for “double-entry journals”

10% on poster presentation

Final grades will be converted to letter grades.

**G-Grades**

Should any student anticipate being in a situation where he/she will be unable to complete the work required of this course, the student should discuss this with the instructor as soon as possible. Under certain circumstances, the student may be granted a G-grade for the term. The student will then have an agreed-upon amount of time (not exceeding one academic year) to satisfactorily complete the work for the course. Upon receiving all work, the course instructor would evaluate the work and enter a permanent grade into the student’s record.

**Grievance Procedures**

The purpose of grievance procedures is to ensure the rights and responsibilities of faculty and students in their relationships with each other. When a student taking a course in the Doctor of Education Program (EdD) believes that a faculty member has not met his or her obligations (as an instructor or in another capacity) as described in the Academic Integrity Guidelines, the student should follow the procedure described in the Guidelines by (1) first trying to resolve the matter with the faculty member directly; (2) then, if needed, attempting to resolve the matter through conversations with the EdD Program Director, Dr. Thomas Akiva [tomakiva@pitt.edu](mailto:tomakiva@pitt.edu); (3) if needed, next talking with the academic integrity officer of the school, Asst. Dean Shederick McClendon, [samcclendon@pitt.edu](mailto:samcclendon@pitt.edu); and (4) if needed, filing a written statement of charges with Asst. Dean McClendon.

**Late Submission/Re-Submission**

Late assignments will not be accepted except in cases that have been cleared by the instructors ahead of time. Extensions must be requested at least 24 hours prior to the due date for an assignment. Any extension will include a new, agreed upon submission date. No assignments will be accepted after the extension deadline has passed. Note that late assignments will have lowest priority for grading and feedback.

**Required Materials**

All materials are available in Canvas or will be provided during on-line class sessions or by instructors through email.

**Sexual Misconduct**

The University of Pittsburgh is committed to the maintenance of a community free from all forms of sexual misconduct. Sexual misconduct violates University policy as well as state, federal, and local laws. It is neither permitted nor condoned. It is also a violation of the University of Pittsburgh’s policy against sexual misconduct for any employee or student at the University of Pittsburgh to attempt in any way to retaliate against a person who makes a claim of sexual misconduct. Any individual who, after thorough investigation and an informal or formal hearing, is found to have violated the University’s policy against sexual misconduct, will be subject to disciplinary action, including, but not limited to, reprimand, suspension, termination, or expulsion. Any disciplinary action taken will depend upon the severity of the offense. For more information, see: [University of Pittsburgh's Sexual Misconduct Policy](https://cfo.pitt.edu/policies/documents/policy06-05-01web.pdf)