

NIMBYism at Home and Abroad (Senior Seminar)
POL 491, Spring 2014
MWF 12:30-1:20, BRNG B206

Instructor: Professor Daniel P. Aldrich
Email: daniel.aldrich[at]gmail.com

Office Hours: MW 11:00 – 12:00
Office Location: BRNG 2234

Course overview:

During the semester, students will intensely explore the phenomenon known colloquially as NIMBY (“Not In My Back Yard”)ism. Through cross-national case studies, we will look at how decisions concerning controversial facilities are effected by local resistance and concern. Specific topics include environmental racism, issues of equity and fairness, risk perception, governmental strategies for handling NIMBY conflicts, and possible solutions. To enhance our knowledge and to participate in local politics, we will carry out field studies of local NIMBY phenomena in the area. Successful completion of this class will provide students not only with theoretical knowledge of this important topic, but experience working with it directly as well.

Student requirements:

1. An analytical research paper (15-20 pages) on a topic of your choice involving a local NIMBY conflict. It should include theoretical concepts and frameworks covered in class alongside your empirical observations (based on interviews, field visits, data analysis, and/or archival research) of the conflict. Progress on this research project will be checked throughout the semester through various benchmarks.
2. A formal presentation of your project and findings to the class in late April/early May.
3. Preparation for, and participation in, class discussions. Students will lead class discussion regularly based on a sign up sheet circulated early in the semester. You are expected to follow the Purdue University Class Attendance and Absence Reporting Policy, meaning that you are required to attend all lectures and events. Absences will be excused only for documented illness, accident, or emergency as determined by the Dean of Students.
4. A brief, take-home final exam.

For all work, the Purdue University Student Code of Conduct is in effect. Every assignment, paper, quiz, and exam must be your own work; all papers will be checked via SafeAssign software for evidence of copying or cutting-and-pasting. Plagiarism will not be tolerated; students who cheat or copy will fail the course and be turned into the Dean of Students.

Evaluation: 100 – 94 A, 93-90 A-, 89-87 B+, 86-84 B, 83-80 B-, 79-77 C+, 76-74 C, 73-70 C-, 69-67 D+, 66-64 D, 63-60 D-, 59 (and below) F

Class participation and discussion leading	25%
Research paper	40%
Presentation	25%
Final Exam	10%

Required books (all other readings will be available online through **Blackboard**):

- 1) Robert Bullard. 2000. *Dumping in Dixie*. New York: Westview Press.
- 2) Daniel P. Aldrich. 2008/2010. *Site Fights: Divisive Facilities and Civil Society in Japan and the West*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- 3) Greg McAvoy. 1999. *Controlling Technocracy*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Course Schedule

January 13 Introduction

Goals: To understand the requirements and expectations for the course. To meet classmates and understand the structure of a research paper. To understand where to get outside help (Academic Success Center, Writing Center, etc.).

Questions: What are the names of your classmates? What are the important parts of a research paper? If you need academic or personal assistance, where should you go?

Readings: Please purchase all required texts online (amazon.com, etc.) as soon as possible.

January 15 Introduction

Goal: To enlarge our understanding of potential NIMBY problems.

Questions: What are NIMTOO and LULU (Star Wars robots, perhaps?), and how do they fit with NIMBY? Are potentially dangerous facilities the only targets of Not in My Back Yard opposition? How do nurseries and bug spraying fit into this category? Are NIMBYists reasonable, according to Inhaber? How do technocracy and democracy fit into McAvoy's view of NIMBY politics? Is his view similar to that of Inhaber? What examples of NIMBYism do you see in West Lafayette or Indiana right now?

Reading: Herbert Inhaber. 1998. *Slaying the NIMBY Dragon*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers. Chapter 1 pp. 1-12 .

Gregory McAvoy. 1999. *Controlling Technocracy*. Chapter 1 pp. 1-19

January 17 Definitions and characteristics of NIMBYism

Goal: To begin a discussion of potential solutions to NIMBY responses.

Questions: Why does Rabe call NIMBY a "realistic response"? What two factors make siting agreements over controversial facilities likely? How do issues of equity figure in? What solutions does Rabe propose?

Reading: Barry Rabe. 1994. *Beyond NIMBY*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution. First and last chapters, pp. 1-27 and 148-169.

January 20 No Class (MLK holiday)

January 22 Definitions and characteristics (II)

Goal: To be able to explain what a NIMBY problem is, list possible causes, give several examples of it, and point to proposed solutions.

Questions: How do Mazmanian and Morell define the NIMBY problem? What causes do they see for it, and what solutions are possible? What is the "imbalance in the distribution of a project's benefits and costs"? What consequences come with NIMBY politics? What solution does Inhaber propose to solve the NIMBY problem? What assumptions come with his approach?

Readings: Daniel Mazmanian and David Morell. 1994. "The NIMBY Syndrome." In Norman Vig and Michael Kraft, eds. *Environmental Policy in the 1990s*. Washington DC: CQ Press, pp. 125-143.

January 24 **Definitions and characteristics (wrap-up)**

Goal: To be able to interpret a quantitative analysis of the siting of controversial facilities and understand the argument that the potential for collective action may drive siting decisions.

Questions: What sorts of phenomena are the “externalities” to which Hamilton refers? According to Hamilton, what do firms siting facilities take into account? Based on this model, should an area that has greater voter turnout than average expect to be slated for siting? Does Hamilton’s argument contradict arguments about environmental racism, or does it support them?

Reading: James Hamilton. 1993. “Politics and Social Costs: Estimating the Impact of Collective Action on Hazardous Waste Facilities.” *RAND Journal of Economics* 24:1, pp. 101-125.

January 27 **The Role of State Structures**

Goal: To understand how state structure (and the accompanying law system) might affect NIMBY protest.

Questions: What differentiates centralized from decentralized nations, and what are examples of each? What about levels of state-society differentiation; how do France and the United States compare? What is Boyle measuring when she counts the number of anti-nuclear court cases in each country? According to her, how were France and the U.S. similar? Can we apply her approach to more different structures at lower levels of government?

Reading: Elizabeth Boyle. 1998. “Political Frames and Legal Activity: The Cases of Nuclear Power in Four Countries.” *Law and Society Review* Volume 32 Number 1, pp. 141 –174.

January 29 **Types and Impact of State Policy Instruments**

Goal: To understand how some governments have tried to facilitate facility siting.

Questions: What are common explanations for success at siting in Japan? What alternative explanation does Aldrich offer? What distinguishes authority, incentive, capacity, symbolic, and learning tools from each other? Have the tools of the Japanese state remained static over time? How successful have these tools been in the long run? What policy tools are highlighted by McAvoy in his discussion of Minnesota? What role does publicity play?

Reading: Daniel P. Aldrich. 2005. “The Limits of Flexible and Adaptive Institutions: The Japanese Government’s Role in Nuclear Power Plant Siting over the Post War Period.” In Daigee Shaw and S. Hayden Lesbirel, eds. *Managing Conflict in Facility Siting* (Edward Elgar Pub.).

Gregory McAvoy. 1999. *Controlling Technocracy*. Chapter 3 pp. 59–87.

Additionally: Come to class with a one sentence written proposal for a paper topic involving a local conflict over land use here in West Lafayette, Carmel, or someplace nearby in Indiana, Illinois, or Ohio. We will break into small groups to discuss and provide feedback on these ideas.

January 31 Environmental racism

Goals: To understand how citizens in communities of color view environmental movements and relevant environmental problems.

Questions: According to Bullard, who is most likely to be involved in environmental movements? What problems often accompany housing for communities of color? What is job blackmail? How does the town of Triana exemplify racial disparity?

Readings: Robert Bullard. 2000. *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Pp 1-20.

February 3 Research and Library Day.

Goal: To know how to find relevant sources, texts, and datasets in Purdue Libraries.

Questions: What is the Toxics Release Inventory? What legal resources are available on this subject? What is GIS information, and where can you get it on campus? What is the name of the librarian who assists social science research?

Reading: Come to class prepared to learn more about resources available to us.

Herbert Inhaber. 2001. "NIMBY and LULU." *Cato Review of Business and Government*, p. 1-4.

February 5 Environmental racism (II)

Goal: To be able to describe cases of environmental racism and possible explanations for these outcomes.

Questions: Have developers and governments deliberately targeted minority communities? What evidence does Bullard bring to support his argument? How have minority groups responded? Can you think of another explanation for these data? What methodology does Aldrich use to answer the question of where unwanted projects go in Japan? Does he find evidence for discrimination in his analysis? What might Aldrich say about Bullard's approach?

Reading: Robert Bullard. 1990. *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Pp. 37-73.

Daniel P. Aldrich. 2008. *Site Fights: Divisive Facilities and Civil Society in Japan and the West*. Chapter 1: Picking Sites (pp. 26-49).

February 7 Environmental racism (III)

Goal: To gain working knowledge of one city's struggle to balance economic growth and jobs with the resulting environmental consequences.

Questions: How did race impact upon hiring decisions within U.S. Steel? How did racial segregation impact purchasing patterns, and why would this interest us? Why didn't local officials move to enforce existing environmental regulations, or enact stricter ones? Did U.S. Steel locate its plant and further expansions with the concentration of race or minority groups in mind?

Reading: Andrew Hurley. 1995. *Environmental Inequalities: Class, Race, and Industrial Pollution in Gary Indiana 1945 - 1980*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. Chapter 2 pp. 15-45.

February 10 Environmental racism (IV)

Goal: To be able to suggest possible causes of the inequities in the distribution of risks, remedies to environmental racism and ways of ameliorating existing conditions.

Questions: What do Mohai and Bryant mean when they state that “Minority communities are at a disadvantage not only in terms of resources...”? According to Bullard, how has environmental racism entered into the “national public policy debate”? What are “fair share” models, and how do they relate to “environmental justice frameworks”? What lessons have activists learned from their experiences?

Reading: Robert Bullard. 1990. *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp 113-139.

Paul Mohai and Bunyan Bryant. 1992. “Race, Poverty, and the Environment.” *EPA Journal* 18:1, 1-3. [We’ll read the full article next class.]

February 12 Research / Library Fieldwork Day

Goal: To make progress on the research paper. Begin calling informants for interviews, set up visits to field sites, gather census data on the areas.

Questions: What is the outcome you are trying to explain? How will you defend your hypothesis? What evidence can you bring?

February 14 Research / Library Fieldwork Day

Goal: To make progress on the research paper. Begin calling informants for interviews, set up visits to field sites, gather census data on the areas.

Questions: What is the outcome you are trying to explain? How will you defend your hypothesis? What evidence can you bring?

February 17 Environmental Racism (wrap-up)

Goal: To attempt to parse out the effects of race and income on the siting of unwanted facilities.

Questions: What have previous studies concluded in their studies of race and income in terms of distribution inequalities? Has race or income been the primary factor? Can we separate out the two? Or does race always have an effect on the distribution of environmental hazards independent of class or income? What counterarguments are available?

Reading: Paul Mohai and Bunyan Brant. “Environmental Racism: Reviewing the Evidence,” in *Race and the Incidence of Environmental Hazards: A Time for Discourse*, edited by Bunyan Brant and Paul Mohai, p. 163–176.

February 19 Risk and Awareness (I)

Goal: To connect technological changes and scientific advancements to general concerns about risk and safety.

Questions: How does Piller link optimism to NIMBY fights? What connections are there between anti-project groups and religious or ethical movements? Whom does Piller blame for heightened fears and concerns? Do you agree with his conclusions?

Reading: Charles Piller. 1991. *The Fail Safe Society: Community Defiance and the End of American Technological Optimism*. New York: Basic Books. Chapters 1 -2, pp. 1–36.

February 21 Risk and Awareness (wrap-up)

Goal: To understand a struggle over siting from an anthropological perspective.

Questions: What does Gusterson mean by the “fluidity of risk perceptions?” Did the anti-incinerator group have sole access to arguments about environmentalism? What strategies did the CARE activists use? Did the outcome of this case come about because of broader anti-nuclear or anti-facility sentiment? If not, what contributed to the outcome? How do the citizens surveyed by McAvoy envision risk in the Minnesota case? Did demographic characteristics explain citizens’ opinions about the hazardous waste facility? What drove their thinking?

Readings: Hugh Gusterson. 2000. “How Not to Construct a Radioactive Waste Incinerator.” *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 25:3 (Summer).

Gregory McAvoy. 1999. *Controlling Technocracy*. Chapter 4 (pp. 89 – 121).

February 24 Cases in North America and Canada

Goal: To understand the Yucca Mountain fight from economic, political, and engineering points of view.

Questions: What kind of site is the Yucca Mountain area? Who have been the opponents, and who are the supporters? What larger lessons are there from the struggle to site this reactor? Are calls for changing the overall approach to energy irrelevant to the facts of the case? What approach has the state of Nevada taken?

Reading: Simon Lobdell. 2002. “The Yucca Mountain Repository and the Future of Reprocessing.” Available at <http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2002/simonlobdell.pdf>.

“Reporter at Large: Yucca Mountain” (in the New Yorker) at <http://archives.newyorker.com/?i=1988-05-23#folio=060>

Two articles from Harry Reid’s website on the topic (<http://www.reid.senate.gov/issues/yucca#.UwoL8vldUrW>)

[Http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/fs-yucca-license-review.html](http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/fs-yucca-license-review.html)

And any two documents from <http://www.nrc.gov/waste/hlw-disposal/yucca-lic-app.html>

February 26 Cases in North America and Canada (II) [student led section]

Goal: To be able to analyze how prisons are viewed by rural communities in the south.

Questions: What are examples of potential outcomes, both positive and negative, of prisons for rural communities? In what way do these facilities “never go out of business”? According to Hoyman, do most NC counties see prisons as trophies or NIMBYs? Why?

Reading: Michele Hoyman. 2001. “Prisons in North Carolina: Are they a Viable Strategy for Rural Communities?” In *International Journal of Economic Development, S.P.A.E.*, special volume on Community Economic Development.

February 28 Cases in America and Canada (wrap-up) [student led section]

Goal: To view the “voluntary” approach to siting in context of a Canadian case.

Questions: What aspects of this process differentiated it as a “voluntary” one? Why were the outcomes “rare”? What veto points existed for local communities? Why was Swan Hills open to the proposal for hosting the facility? Did economic factors play a role in the Montcalm case, or in any of them, for that matter?

Reading: Geoffrey Castle and Don Munton. 1996. “Voluntary Siting of Hazardous Waste Facilities in Western Canada.” In Don Munton, ed. *Hazardous Waste Siting and Democratic Choice*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press. pp. 57-83.

Additionally: Email me with a one-page summary of your paper idea which includes: your topic, your research plan (how you’ll get data, whom you plan on interviewing), and a possible argument along with how you’ll know if your argument is correct.

March 3 Research / Library Fieldwork Day

Goal: To make progress on the research paper. Begin calling informants for interviews, set up visits to field sites, gather census data on the areas.

Questions: What is the outcome you are trying to explain? How will you defend your hypothesis? What evidence can you bring?

March 5 Cases from Japan [student led section]

Goal: To use cases on Japanese siting to enhance our understanding of the NIMBY problem.

Questions: Why is Japan a good test case for theories of site selection? In what way does civil society play a role in siting and in government response to conflict? In what ways are the Japan and French airport siting cases similar, and in what ways are they different? What lessons can we draw from these studies?

Reading: Daniel P. Aldrich. 2008. *Site Fights: Divisive Facilities and Civil Society in Japan and the West*. Introduction (pp. 1-26), Chapter 3: Occasional Turbulence (pp. 70-95)

March 7 Cases from Japan (II)

Goal: To be able to analyze conflicts over Japan’s reactor siting.

Questions: What are the keys to understanding Japan’s NIMBY processes? Is conflict constant across cases? What role has the government played in the process? How do property rights in Japan and France differ from those of the United States, and why does it matter? How have fishing cooperatives gained, at least in one way, over time?

Reading: Daniel P. Aldrich. 2008. *Site Fights*. Chapter 5: Trying to Change Hearts and Minds (pp. 119-151), Chapter 6: David vs. Goliath (pp. 152-184)

March 10 Cases from Japan (wrap-up)

Goal: To test notions that link Japanese responses to facilities with Japanese culture, and to open up a new area of comparison with cases involving airports and waste facilities in Japan.

Questions: Does Japanese culture prevent the formation of anti-project groups? What factors may damp down resistance? Does Munton see NIMBY as a solely a American or European phenomenon? What factors do Apter and Sawa stress as creating a confrontation over Narita? How can we explain the especially violent response from local anti-airport farmers? Who else participated in the anti-Narita activities, and why? Are there connections to the time period during which the airport was proposed?

Reading: David Apter and Negayo Sawa. 1984. *Against the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Chapter 1.

Don Munton. 1996. "Siting Hazardous Waste Facilities, Japanese Style." In Don Munton, ed. *Hazardous Waste Siting*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press pp. 181-229.

March 12 Cases from France and Germany (I)

Goal: To place anti-facility movements within the broader perspective of social movements.

Questions: Do Nelkin and Pollak see anti-nuclear opposition as a narrow, inwardly focused phenomenon? If not, what do they use to frame their discussion? What differences do we see in state strategies for nuclear power in France and Germany? What ideologies drive nuclear programs in these countries?

Reading: Dorothy Nelkin and Michael Pollak. 1981. *The Atom Besieged*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Chapters 1 and 2.

March 14 Cases from France and Germany (II)

Goal: To use the study of anti-nuclear movements in Germany to gain leverage over theoretical concepts of state structure and political culture.

Questions: What factors play a major role, according to Joppke, in determining the shape of anti-nuclear movements in America and Germany? How do state structures and political culture interact, if at all?

Reading: Christian Joppke. 1993. *Mobilizing Against Nuclear Energy*. Los Angeles: University of California Press. Last Chapter.

Additionally: Email me a one- to two- page filled-in outline of your research paper, divided into sections including introduction, methodology, evidence, and conclusions.

March 17 No Class [Spring Break]

March 19 No Class [Spring Break]

March 21 No Class [Spring Break]

March 24 Cases from France and Germany (wrap-up)

Goal: To view German controversial facility siting from a closer, procedural approach.

Questions: How does Germany's federalist system impact hazardous waste management? What has been the primary approach of governments in Germany when siting facilities? What aspects of North American siting have not been attempted in Germany, according to Seeliger? Where does

Seeliger see Germany's facility siting procedures going in the future? How do Seeliger's and Joppke's accounts of siting in Germany differ?

Reading: Robert Seeliger. 1996. "Siting Hazardous Waste Incinerators in Germany." In Don Munton, ed. *Hazardous Waste Siting and Democratic Choice*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 230-270.

March 26 Cases from England, and Mexico

Goal: To understand how an English observer envisions Not In My Back Yardism in his country.

Questions: To what phenomena does Ehrman link "nimbyism" (as he calls it)? How do homeowning, economic growth, and commuting tie together here? Does his analysis imply that less developing nations should experience less negative feedback?

Reading: Richard Ehrman. 1990. *NIMBYism: The Disease and the Cure*. London: Centre for Policy Studies. Chapter 1.

March 28 Fieldwork and Write Up Day

Goal: To make progress on the research paper. Begin calling informants for interviews, set up visits to field sites, gather census data on the areas.

Questions: What is the outcome you are trying to explain? How will you defend your hypothesis? What evidence can you bring?

March 31 No Class

April 2 Cases from England and Mexico (wrap up) [student led]

Goal: To use both social movement and political opportunities theories to better understand anti-facility protest.

Questions: How does autonomy fit into Garcia-Gorena's theoretical framework for explaining the antinuclear power movement in Mexico? What are political opportunities, and how did they impact the anti-nuclear movement in Mexico? What tactics were most commonly used by the movements, and why?

Reading: Velma Garcia-Gorena. 1999. *Mothers and the Mexican Antinuclear Power Movement*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. Last chapter.

April 4 Perceptions of Stigma

Goal: To appreciate a stigma-based approach to NIMBY politics.

Questions: Are community reactions to AIDS and homeless shelters a function of the facility or of the community? How does Takahashi link capital interests to facility siting? What role does stigma play, according to her? Which would be harder to site: an AIDS hospice or a homeless shelter? Think about the image people have of trailer-parks; what could be done to decrease any stigma associated with hosting these facilities?

Reading: Lois Takahashi. 1998. *Homelessness, AIDS, and Stigmatization: The NIMBY syndrome in the United States at the End of the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Chapter 2 pp. 23 – 43.

April 7 Risk Perception and Public Participation

Goal: To investigate risk perception and public perception in facility siting -facility sentiment.

Questions: How did scientists, businesspeople, and environmentalists differ in their responses to the survey of Jenkins-Smith and Bassett? Do the results indicate that people will, to put it simply, stick with their beliefs regardless of the facts? If so, what are the implications for policies that provide information and public relations attempts? Beierle and Cayford distinguish among managerialism, pluralism, and popular democracy; what differences are there? Why should we be interested in the question of public participation? If Jenkins-Smith and Bassett are right, what weight should be put into designing forums with more participation?

Reading: Thomas Beierle and Jerry Cayford. 2002. *Democracy in Practice: Public Participation in Environmental Decisions*. Washington DC: Resources for the Future. First and last chapters.

Howard Jenkins-Smith and G. Bassett. 1994. "Perceived Risk and Uncertainty of Nuclear Waste." *Risk Analysis* 14:5, 851-856.

April 9 Solutions?

Goal: To be familiar with proposed solutions to NIMBY problems, and to be able to evaluate them in light of our past case studies and theories.

Questions: Zeiss advocates prevention, controls, mitigation, and compensation – what are these, and how can they improve siting attempts? In his analysis of 67 siting cases, what approaches fared best?

Readings: McAvoy, Gregory. 1999. *Controlling Technocracy*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press. Last chapter (pp. 123-144).

Christopher Zeiss. 1996. "Directions for Engineering Contributions to Successfully Siting Hazardous Waste Facilities." In Don Munton, ed. *Hazardous Waste Siting and Democratic Choice*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 358-394.

Additionally: By, email me a draft of your completed research paper.

April 11 In-class Peer Review of Papers

Goal: Bring a hard copy of your draft to class today. We will break into groups and peer-review the papers. Each student will read two other papers during class and fill out provided evaluation sheets.

April 14 International Cross-Over

Goal: To understand how international and transnational non governmental organizations can impact NIMBY struggles.

Questions: When are outcomes of struggles over dams most likely to be altered? How have transnational advocacy organizations impacted nation states? How do social mobilization and degree of democracy figure into the model? What lessons are there for our studies of local NIMBY projects?

Reading: Sanjeev Khagram. 2004. *Dams and Development: Transnational Struggles for Water and Power*. Chapter 1 pp. 1 – 32.

April 16 **No Class: Passover**

April 18 **Paper Completion and Presentation Rehearsal**

Goal: Spend this time working on your presentation. Practice it several times to ensure that you can give the entire talk in 11 minutes or less; no additional time will be allotted in class, so you'll be cut off if you run over. Give the talk to your friends, suite mates, and other victims. Think about the use of handouts, pictures, PowerPoint, or slides to enhance your points. What is your main argument? Do all of your slides support it? Are you using pictures or words to get your points across?

April 21 **Student presentations**

Goal: Students will present their findings on local NIMBY problems. Each presentation is allotted a maximum of eleven minutes.

April 23 **Student Presentations**

Goal: Students will present their findings on local NIMBY problems. Each presentation is allotted a maximum of eleven minutes.

April 25 **Student presentations**

Goal: Students will present their findings on local NIMBY problems. Each presentation is allotted a maximum of eleven minutes.

April 28 **No Class**

April 30 **Student presentations**

Goal: Students will present their findings on local NIMBY problems. Each presentation is allotted a maximum of eleven minutes.

May 2 **Student presentations and Wrap Up**

Goal: Students will present their findings on local NIMBY problems. Each presentation is allotted a maximum of eleven minutes.

Hard copies of final papers are due by May 2. No late papers will be accepted.

Take Home Final Exam due by final exam date scheduled by the Registrar's Office.

Note: This syllabus is a living, organic creation, and it may change over the course of the semester in response to changing classroom and campus conditions. More specifically, in the event of a major campus emergency, course requirements, deadlines and grading percentages are subject to changes that may be necessitated by a revised semester calendar or other circumstances. Use the Blackboard Vista web page to keep track of the most recent version of the syllabus along with my email address to get information.