

Pols 333: Electoral Politics

Spring 2027, Tuesday and Thursday 2:30-3:45, LNGH 231

Dr. William O'Brochta (wobrochta@tlu.edu, LNGH 104, 830-372-6566)

Student Office Hours: Tuesday 8:15-9:15 and 1:15-2:15 and Thursday 1:15-2:15

Syllabus Updated: January 18, 2027

Shared Folder Link: <https://pols.tiny.us/333spring2027>

Course Description: Voting, election day, and political campaigns are all parts of electoral politics, but we will take a broader perspective, thinking about electoral politics as part of an ongoing process of fighting for, obtaining, communicating with, and losing representation. We will approach these topics from a comparative perspective, while grounding our theories in the practical matter of understanding how civic engagement --- which includes, but is not limited to, electoral participation --- takes shape on campus and in the community. In particular, we will focus on formation and communication about political opinions and beliefs through different methods of political communication, particularly deliberative dialogues.

Prerequisites: Pols 231.

Text: None. See readings on Brightspace.

Catalog Description: Campaigns and their management; theories of voting behavior; some involvement by the student in campaigns going on during the course is required.

Student Learning Objectives:

At the completion of this course, students will be able to:

1. Describe and make connections between different ways that representation occurs.
2. Think critically to identify the process of electoral politics and how it fits into broader representational themes.
3. Synthesize knowledge about American electoral politics with an investigation of elections worldwide.
4. Apply your knowledge to community engaged situations.
5. Collaborate in a team to produce meaningful, evidence-based community work.
6. Connect political science to local issues and to public policy.

Course Philosophy:

This course is being taught as part of the Department of Political Science Research Lab. Lab courses are small seminars wherein students work together to complete major research-related projects. In addition, all lab courses are focused on developing teamwork, project management, and career-focused skills. There are some scholarly readings to help us think about relevant questions related to electoral politics. Typical class sessions will include a student led discussion using different approaches to representation described below and time to work on the deliberative democracy projects that are a core part of the course. If you are still interested after the semester is over, there are opportunities to continue to work on these projects and to see them integrated into the TLU community. Think of this course as preparation for the kinds of civic or community engaged tasks you might encounter in the workforce.

Project Overview:

You will work together to plan, organize, and lead a series of deliberative dialogue discussions -- using appropriate deliberation models --- that examine key issues on campus and in the community. The discussions will engage with partner organizations and will be aimed at addressing real issues or questions. Depending on the issue, these dialogues will either lead into a final report making recommendations to stakeholders based on what was learned or additional, longer-term dialogue will be needed that you will work to integrate into existing structures. In addition, we will complete a participatory budgeting project to better understand and support financial-based change on campus.

Assignments: This course is graded using narrative evaluations. There are minimum standards listed to earn a “D” in the course. You must establish specific criteria and benchmarks for yourself in your narrative that I agree to and then you achieve to earn a grade higher than a “D.” Specified dates for assignment submissions are not negotiable. Reference the initial narrative assignment and the narrative evaluation assignments for more details. Failing to meet the minimum standards will result in failing the course.

| Item | Minimum Standard |
|--------------------------|--|
| Initial Narrative | Complete initial narrative. |
| CITI Training | Complete CITI training. |
| Vocation and Class Rules | Complete at least one of the two assignments. |
| Reading | Read assigned material for at least 40 minutes. |
| Discussion Preparation | Submit material demonstrating preparation for at least nine of eighteen discussions. |
| Attendance | Miss no more than 5 class sessions. |
| Class Engagement | Engaged in every class session with at least one meaningful contribution. |
| Discussion Leader | Complete at least one or fourteen discussion leaders. |
| Campaign Connection | Complete at least one of fourteen campaign connections. |
| Participatory Budgeting | Submit material demonstrating preparation for the activity. |
| TLU Dialogue | Adequately engage and support your group. |
| Community Dialogue | Adequately engage and support your group. |
| Narrative Evaluation | Complete at least three of four narrative evaluations. |

Topics and Readings: Below is the schedule of reading and assignments for each class. I may change the course outline, but I will give you plenty of prior notice.¹

Day 1: Introduction and Setting Class Rules

Day 2: Class Rules and Vocation

- Required Reading:

¹ I have made a conscious effort to represent gender and ethnic/regional diversity of scholarship in these readings.

- Braskamp, Larry, and Caryn McTighe Musil. 2011. *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges and Universities.
- Hunnicutt, Lynn. 2018. "Vocation and Civil Discourse: Discerning and Defining." *Intersections: Faith, Learning, and the Vocation of Lutheran Higher Education* 48: 6-9.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Cook-Sather, Alison, Kelly Matthews, Anita Ntem, and Sandra Leathwick. 2018. "What We Talk About When We Talk About Students as Partners." *International Journal for Students as Partners* 2(2).
 - Anderson, Per. 2012. "Cultivating Transformative Responsible Dialogue: Community of Moral Deliberation and Lutheran Higher Education." *Intersections: Faith, Learning, and the Vocation of Lutheran Higher Education* 35: 10-16
 - Morrow, Terence. 2011. "The State of Civil Discourse on Campus and in Society." *Intersections: Faith, Learning, and the Vocation of Lutheran Higher Education* 33: 13-17.
 - Meinking, Kristina, and Eric Hall. 2024. "Enhancing Trust and Embracing Vulnerability in the College Classroom: A Reflection on Ungrading and Co-Creation in Teaching and Learning." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 12: 1-15.
- Assignments Due: Beginning of semester survey. Class rules due. Sign up for assignments on OneDrive.

Day 3: Theories of Representation

- Required Reading:
 - Mansbridge, Jane. 2003. "Rethinking Representation." *The American Political Science Review* 97(4): 515-528.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Chu, Jonathan, Scott Williamson, and Eddy Yeung. 2024. "People Consistently View Elections and Civil Liberties as Key Components of Democracy." *Science* 386(6719): 291-296.
 - Warren, Mark. 2017. "A Problem-Based Approach to Democratic Theory." *The American Political Science Review* 111(1): 39-53.
 - Rehfeld, Andrew. 2006. "Towards a General Theory of Political Representation." *The Journal of Politics* 68(1): 1-21.
 - Dryzek, John, et al. 2019. "The Crisis of Democracy and the Science of Deliberation." *Science* 363(6432): 1144-1146.
- Assignments Due: Initial narrative. All assignments must be signed up for on OneDrive.

Day 4: Direct Democracy

- Required Reading:
 - Radcliff, Benjamin, and Gregory Shufeldt. 2016. "Direct Democracy and Subjective Well-Being: The Initiative and Life Satisfaction in the American States." *Social Indicators Research* 128: 140-51423.
- Suggested Reading:

- Hobolt, Sara. 2006. "Direct Democracy and European Integration." *Journal of European Public Policy* 13(1): 153-166.
- Altmann, David. 2017. "The Potential of Direct Democracy: A Global Measure (1900-2014)." *Social Indicators Research* 133. 1207-1227.
- Tolbert, Caroline, and Daniel Smith. 2006. "Representation and Direct Democracy in the United States." *Representation* 42(1): 25-44.
- Assignments Due: Vocation.

Day 5: Issues in Direct Democracy

- Required Reading:
 - Burnett, Craig, Elizabeth Garrett, and Mathew McCubbins. 2010. "The Dilemma of Direct Democracy." *Election Law Journal* 9(4): 305-324.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Clark, Sherman. 1998. "A Populist Critique of Direct Democracy." *Harvard Law Review* 112: 434-482.
 - Donovan, Todd, and Jeffrey Karp. 2006. "Popular Support for Direct Democracy." *Party Politics* 12(5): 671-688.
 - Fatke, Matthias, and Markus Freitag. 2013. "Direct Democracy: Protest Catalyst or Protest Alternative?" *Political Behavior* 35: 237-260.
 - Gastil, John, and Robert Richards. 2013. "Making Direct Democracy Deliberative Through Random Assemblies." *Politics and Society* 41(2): 253-281.

Day 6: Project Workday

- Assignments Due:
 - First narrative evaluation.
 - CITI Training.

Day 7: Liberal Democracy

- Required Reading:
 - Habermas, Jurgen. 1995. "Reconciliation Through the Public Use of Reason: Remarks on John Rawls's Political Liberalism." *The Journal of Philosophy* 92(3): 109-131.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Rawls, John. 1995. "Political Liberalism: Reply to Habermas." *The Journal of Philosophy* 92(3): 132-180.
 - Alejandro, Roberto. 1996. "What is Political About Rawl's Political Liberalism?" *The Journal of Politics* 58(1): 1-24.

Day 8: Issues in Liberal Democracy

- Required Reading:
 - Schuit, Sophie, and Jon Rogowski. 2017. "Race, Representation, and the Voting Rights Act." *American Journal of Political Science* 61(3): 513-526.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Song, Sarah. 2009. "Democracy and Noncitizen Voting Rights." *Citizenship Studies* 13(6): 607-620.

- Chilton, Adam, and Mila Versteeg. 2018. "Courts' Limited Ability to Protect Constitutional Rights." *The University of Chicago Law Review* 85(2): 293-336.
- Beckman, Ludvig. 2008. "Who Should Vote? Conceptualizing Universal Suffrage in Studies of Democracy." *Democratization* 15(1): 29-48.

Day 9: Autocracy

- Required Reading:
 - Olson, Mancur. 1993. "Dictatorship, Democracy, and Development." *The American Political Science Review* 87(3): 567-576.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Charron, Nicholas, and Victor Lapuente. 2011. "Which Dictators Produce Quality of Government?" *Studies in Comparative International Development* 46: 397-423.
 - Finkel, Evgeny. 2012. "The Authoritarian Advantage of Horizontal Accountability: Ombudsmen in Poland and Russia." 44(3): 291-310.
 - Guriev, Sergei, and Daniel Triesman. 2020. "The Popularity of Authoritarian Leaders: A Cross-National Investigation." *World Politics* 72(4): 601-638.

Day 10: Issues in Autocracy

- Required Reading:
 - Gandhi, Jennifer, Ben Noble, and Milan Svobik. 2020. "Legislatures and Legislative Politics Without Democracy." *Comparative Political Studies* 53(9): 1359-1379.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Frantz, Erika, and Andrea Kendall-Taylor. 2014. "A Dictator's Toolkit: Understanding How Co-Optation Affects Repression in Autocracies." *Journal of Peace Research* 51(3): 332-346.
 - Rozenas, Arturas, and Denis Stukal. 2019. "How Autocrats Manipulate Economic News: Evidence from Russia's State-Controlled Television." *The Journal of Politics* 81(3): 982-996.
 - Shen-Bayh, Fiona. 2018. "Strategies of Repression: Judicial and Extrajudicial Methods of Autocratic Survival." *World Politics* 70(3): 321-357.

Day 11: Project Workday

Day 12: Participatory Budgeting

- Required Reading:
 - Gilman, Hollie Russon. 2012. "Transformative Deliberations: Participatory Budgeting in the United States." *Journal of Public Deliberation* 8(2).
- Suggested Reading:
 - de Sousa Santos, Boaventura. 1998. "Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre: Toward a Redistributive Democracy." *Politics and Society* 26(4): 461-510.
 - Wampler, Brian. 2012. "Participatory Budgeting: Core Principles and Key Impacts." *Journal of Public Deliberation* 8(2).

- Bartlett, Tara, and Daniel Schugurensky. 2024. "Inclusive Civic Education and School Democracy Through Participatory Budgeting." *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice* 19(3): 362-380.

Day 13: Participatory Budgeting

- Assignments Due: Participatory Budgeting Activity.

Day 14: Participatory Budgeting

- Assignments Due: Second narrative evaluation. Optional mid-semester survey.

Day 15: Issues in Participatory Budgeting

- Required Reading:
 - Saguin, Kidjie. 2018. "Why the Poor Do Not Benefit from Community-Driven Development: Lessons from Participatory Budgeting." *World Development* 112: 220-232.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Sintomer, Yves, Carsten Herzberg, and Anja Röcke. 2008. "Participatory Budgeting in Europe: Potentials and Challenges." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(1): 164-178.
 - Baiocchi, Gianpaolo, and Ernesto Ganuza. 2014. "Participatory Budgeting as if Emancipation Mattered." *Politics and Society* 42(1): 29-50.
 - Davidson, Mark. 2018. "Participatory Budgeting, Austerity, and Institutions of Democracy: The Case of Vallejo, California." *City* 22(4): 551-567.
 - Pape, Madeline, and Josh Lerner. 2016. "Budgeting for Equity: How Can Participatory Budgeting Advance Equity in the United States?" *Journal of Public Deliberation* 12(2).
 - Goldfrank, Benjamin. 2012. "The World Bank and the Globalization of Participatory Budgeting." *Journal of Public Deliberation* 8(2).

Day 16: Oligarchy

- Required Reading:
 - Cameron, Maxwell. 2021. "The Return of Oligarchy? Threats to Representative Democracy in Latin America." *Third World Quarterly* 42(4): 775-792.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin Page. 2014. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics* 12(3): 564-581.
 - Zhu, Jiangnan. 2022. "The Rise and Fall of Ruling Oligarchs." *China Review* 22(2): 49-79.
 - Markus, Stanislav, and Volha Charnysh. 2017. "The Flexible Few: Oligarchs and Wealth Defense in Developing Democracies." *Comparative Political Studies* 50(12): 1632-1665.
 - Glasius, Marlies. 2025. "What (Not) to do About Globalized 'Oligarchs'?" *Contemporary Politics*.

Day 17: Populism

- Required Reading:
 - Burbaker, Rogers. 2019. “Populism and Nationalism.” *Nations and Nationalism* 26(1): 44-66.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Kates, Sean, Eric Manning, Tali Mendelberg, and Omar Wasow. 2026. “Plutopopulism: Wealth and Trump’s Financial Base.” *The American Political Science Review* 120(1): 92-109.
 - Hunger, Sophia, and Fred Paxton. 2022. “What’s in a Buzzword? A Systematic Review of the State of Populism Research in Political Science.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 10: 617-633.
 - Mudde, Cas. 2021. “Populism in Europe: An Illiberal Democratic Response to Undemocratic Liberalism.” *Government and Opposition* 56(4): 577-597.
 - Norris, Pippa. 2020. “Measuring Populism Worldwide.” *Party Politics* 26(6): 697-717.

Day 18: Traditional Governance

- Required Reading:
 - House, Toni, and Rebeca Webster. 2023. “Traditional Governance and Indigenous Corn: Picking Back Up Our Yukwanusyuni Roles and Responsibilities.” *Administrative Theory and Praxis* 45(4): 288-305.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Jones-Kerwin, Natalie, and David Peterson. 2024. “Group Consciousness and the Politics of American Indians.” *Political Behavior* 46: 1935-1959.
 - Biolsi, Thomas. 1991. ““Indian Self-Government” as a Technique of Domination.” *American Indian Quarterly* 15(1): 23-28.
 - Cornell, Stephen. 1988. “The Transformations of Tribe: Organization and Self-Concept in Native American Ethnicities.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 11(1): 27-47.
 - Kasten, Erich. 1987. “The Return of the Elders: Contemporary Trends in Indian Self-Government on the Northwest Coast.” *Sociologist* 37(1): 1-19.

Day 19: Anarchy

- Required Reading:
 - Skarbek, David. 2016. “Covenants without the Sword? Comparing Prison Self-Governance Globally.” *The American Political Science Review* 110(4): 845-862.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Murtazashvili, Ilia, and Jennifer Murtazashvili. 2015. “Anarchy, Self-Governance, and Legal Titling.” *Public Choice* 162: 287-305.
 - Azari, Julia, and Jennifer Smith. 2012. “Unwritten Rules: Informal Institutions in Established Democracies.” *Perspectives on Politics* 10(1): 37-55.
 - Rode, Martin. 2022. “The Institutional Foundations of Surf Break Governance in Atlantic Europe.” *Public Choice* 190: 175-204.

Day 20: Project Workday

- Assignments Due: Third narrative evaluation.

Day 21: Campaigns

- Required Reading:
 - Lucas, Jack, et al. 2025. “Politicians’ Theories of Voting Behavior.” *The American Political Science Review* 119(3): 1304-1321.
- Suggested Reading:
 - O’Brochta, William, and Patrick Cunha Silva. 2025. “Language Cues and Perceptions of Nationalism.” *Political Behavior* 47: 1687-1710.
 - Jung, Jae-Hee. 2025. “Varieties of Values: Moral Values are Uniquely Divisive.” *The American Political Science Review* 119(1): 462-478.
 - Webster, Steven, and Mary Adams Plooster. 2026. “Anger, Negative Partisanship, and Joy in the Suffering of Political Others.” *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion, and Parties*.
 - Hewitt, Luke, et al. 2024. “How Experiments Help Campaigns Persuade Voters: Evidence from a Large Archive of Campaigns’ Own Experiments.” *The American Political Science Review* 118(4): 2021-2039.
 - Sides, John, Lynn Vavreck, and Christopher Warshaw. 2022. “The Effect of Television Advertising in United States Elections.” *The American Political Science Review* 116(2): 702-718.
 - Case, Colin, and Rachel Porter. 2025. “Conceptualizing and Measuring Early Campaign Fundraising in Congressional Elections.” *Political Science Research and Methods*.

Day 22: Single Member District Plurality

- Required Reading:
 - Crowder-Meyer, Melody, Shana Kushner Gadarian, and Jessica Trounstein. 2015. “Electoral Institutions, Gender Stereotypes, and Women’s Local Representation.” *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 3(2): 318-334.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Benoit, Kenneth. 2006. “Duverger’s Law and the Study of Electoral Systems.” *French Politics* 4: 69-83.
 - Heath, Oliver, and Adam Ziegfeld. 2022. “Why So Little Strategic Voting in India?” *The American Political Science Review* 116(4): 1523-1529.
 - Singer, Matthew. 2012. “Was Duverger Correct? Single-Member District Election Outcomes in Fifty-Three Countries.” *British Journal of Political Science* 43: 201-220.
 - Liñeira, Robert, and Pedro Riera. 2024. “Why do Majoritarian Systems Benefit the Right? Income groups and Vote Choice Across Different Electoral Systems.” *Political Science Research and Methods* 12(4): 857-869.
 - Komisarchik, Mayya. 2026. “Democrats Versus Democracy: The Southern Response to the Voting Rights Act.” *The Journal of Politics* 88(1): 162-176.

Day 23: Project Workday

Day 24: Proportional Representation

- Required Reading:

- Crisp, Brian, Betul Demirkaya, Leslie Schwindt-Bayer, and Courtney Millian. 2018. "The Role of Rules in Representation." *British Journal of Political Science* 48(1): 47-67.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Smith, Daniel, Alexandra Cirone, Dawn Teele, Gary Cox, and Jon Fiva. 2026. "Hidden Majoritarianism and Women's Career Progression in Proportional Representation Systems." *The American Political Science Review* 120(2): 527-545.
 - Stockemer, Daniel, and Aksel Sundström. 2018. "Age Representation in Parliaments: Can Institutions Pave the Way for the Young?" *European Political Science Review* 10(3): 467-490.
 - Buisseret, Peter, Olle Folke, Carlo Prato, and Johnanna Rickne. 2022. "Party Nomination Strategies in List Proportional Representation Systems." *American Journal of Political Science* 66(3): 714-729.
 - Leeman, Lucas, and Isabela Mares. 2014. "The Adoption of Proportional Representation." *The Journal of Politics* 76(2): 461-478.
 - Janusz, Andrew, and Vanessa Carrión-Yaguana. 2026. "Party Elites and Beauty Biases: Candidate Attractiveness and List Placement." *Party Politics* 32(2): 286-299.

Day 25: Other Electoral Systems

- Required Reading:
 - Mayne, Quinton, and Shane Singh. 2026. "Attitudes Toward Electoral System Reform and Party System Change in the U.S." *The American Political Science Review*.
- Suggested Reading:
 - Cormack, Lindsey. 2024. "More Choices, More Problems? Ranked Choice Voting Errors in New York City." *American Politics Research* 52(3): 306-319.
 - Amy, Douglas. 1996. "The Forgotten History of the Single Transferrable Vote in the United States." *Representation*. 34(1): 13-20.
 - Farrell, David, Jane Suiter, and Clodagh Harris. 2017. "The Challenge of Reforming a 'Voter-Friendly' Electoral System: The Debates Over Ireland's Single Transferable Vote." *Irish Political Studies* 32(2): 293-310.
 - Maeda, Ko. 2025. "Voter Disengagement and Dissatisfaction Under Japan's Mixed Electoral System." *Public Choice* 204-31-50.

Day 26: Project Workday

Day 27: Project Workday

- Assignments Due: Fourth narrative evaluation.
- Note: We will complete the end of semester survey in class. Complete ahead of time in you will not be in class.

Final Exam Period: Report on project results.

Description of Assignments:

Initial Narrative

Minimum Standard: Complete the initial narrative assignment.

The initial narrative is your written proposal to me of what you plan to do in this course and how you plan to do it in order to earn the grade you have listed as earning. If you have completed a contract assessment in another course with me, the general concept is similar --- you are assessing your own performance, and I provide feedback on your assessment. What is different is that you set the standard for what you want to do, so long as it meets the minimum standard required to earn a “D.” Hence, there is more flexibility than in a contract graded course because you are not beholden to hitting certain set benchmarks or standards. Instead, you are responsible for establishing your own benchmarks and standards and evaluating them throughout the semester.

The initial narrative must include:

1. A clear set of sentences that articulates the grade you aim to earn in the course and why you wish to earn this grade.
2. A table similar to the one listed below that lists each required item for the course. You are then expected to provide a brief discussion in the “my standard” column for what you intend to do to complete each item.
3. A narrative that covers each item and the standards you propose holding yourself to such that you earn the grade you wish to earn. Remember that the minimum standards are sufficient for a “D” in the course, so earning an “A” or “B” requires exceeding the minimum standards for basically every item possible.
 - a. Each item should be listed with a header stating the item name.
 - b. Your narrative about each item should include standards beyond the minimum standards that you propose holding yourself to.
 - c. Your narrative about each item should include a series of questions you will use to evaluate whether you have met the standard once the item is partially or fully complete. You will use these questions in your narrative evaluations. The questions should include a mix of countable items (e.g., number, length, et. cetera) and other questions.

| Item | Minimum Standard | My Standard |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------|
| Initial Narrative | Complete initial narrative. | |
| CITI Training | Complete CITI training. | |
| Vocation and Class Rules | Complete at least one of the two assignments. | |
| Reading | Read assigned material for at least 40 minutes. | |
| Discussion Preparation | Submit material demonstrating preparation for at least nine of eighteen discussions. | |
| Attendance | Miss no more than 5 class sessions. | |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Class Engagement | Engaged in every class session with at least one meaningful contribution. | |
| Discussion Leader | Complete at least one or fourteen discussion leaders. | |
| Campaign Connection | Complete at least one of fourteen campaign connections. | |
| Participatory Budgeting | Submit material demonstrating preparation for the activity. | |
| TLU Dialogue | Adequately engage and support your group. | |
| Community Dialogue | Adequately engage and support your group. | |
| Narrative Evaluation | Complete at least three of four narrative evaluations. | |

Accompanying the initial narrative, you should sign up for your proposed discussion leader and campaign connection dates. You are responsible for tracking all the assignments you complete, completing them on time, and accurately reflecting what you did in your narrative evaluations.

Opportunities to Exceed Standard: Provide more than minimal detail in your initial narrative. Provide particularly detailed questions and/or standards for evaluation. Demonstrate creativity and innovation in approaching the narrative evaluation process.

CITI Training

Minimum Standard: Go to <https://about.citiprogram.org> and click “register.” Type “Texas Lutheran University” in the “Organization Affiliation” box. Once you have created an account, take the “Human Subjects Research --- Principal Investigator” course. The course typically takes between 2 and 4 hours to complete. Completion is required or you cannot complete the course. You can use a valid completion certificate that you completed in a different course.

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard: None.

Vocation and Class Rules

Minimum Standard: Complete at least one of these two assignments.

Vocation: Take the content of and activities in this course and discuss how you plan to apply then toward discerning, developing, furthering, and/or or fulfilling parts of your vocation and/or calling. Be deliberate and thoughtful.

Class Rules: Take the preliminary list of class rules that we developed in class. Develop reasoned and well-articulated justifications for three issue positions for each rule: implementing the rule as written, not implementing the rule at all, and implementing a modified version of the rule (specify your modification).

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard: Complete both assignments in a manner that demonstrates meaningful and sustained engagement, research, and consideration of assignment topics and ideas. Be reflective, engage in liberating thought, and create something lasting and thoughtful.

Reading

Minimum Standard: Read assigned material for at least 40 minutes.

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard: Spend additional time reading (at least an hour or an hour and a half), read all assigned material (including additional readings), find related material to read related to the discussion topic, and/or other proposed options.

Discussion Preparation

Minimum Standard: Submit material demonstrating preparation for at least nine discussions.

Discussion preparation includes demonstrating your understanding in at least two areas:

1. Required reading (including some suggested reading listed in the syllabus and/or of your own discovery if you describe your plan to do so in your narrative evaluation).
2. Country connection: Relate the reading and discussion to the country you are following.

Note: Ensure that the materials you prepare for the discussion are submitted to Brightspace, but also that you are ready to participate in the discussion itself without using technology.

To earn a “D,” evidence of understanding in these two areas must be submitted prior to class for at least 9 discussion days. Evidence of understanding must comport with the minimum standard of reading for at least 40 minutes and, therefore, should comprise at least an additional 40 minutes of effort.

Each student will propose one or more ways in which they intend to demonstrate and provide evidence of understanding in the two areas as part of your narrative evaluation. To facilitate the second item, each student will propose following at least one country that has recently had, is having, or will have an election and will list the proposed country(ies) and why they chose them in their initial narrative. For the discussion preparation assignment, you are expected to discuss how the reading relates to the country. You do not need to discuss anything regarding the election in that country unless you so choose (you will discuss the election in the campaign connection assignment).

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard: Submit material demonstrating preparation for more discussions, demonstrate more than minimally adequate preparation, and/or other proposed options. You must propose how you would like to submit evidence that you have prepared for the discussion. Evidence must demonstrate that you actually read the material closely and related the material to your own understanding. You are expected to be able to expand on any of the points mentioned in your discussion preparation during class at any point. Innovative approaches

to demonstrating discussion preparation are welcome, though all approaches must demonstrate that you did the work and that you know what you are talking about.

Attendance

Minimum Standard: Miss no more than 5 class sessions.

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard: Miss 3 or fewer class sessions.

Class Engagement

Minimum Standard: Engage in every class with at least one meaningful contribution.

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard: Engage more frequently and/or document or reflect on engagement in a meaningful way after each class session. You can propose a certain set of practices or behaviors you plan to engage in to ensure good engagement and a system to track those behaviors across narrative evaluations.

Discussion Leader

Minimum Standard: Complete at least one discussion leader assignment.

Discussions will last approximately half of the time in their respective class sessions. Discussion leaders will lead the discussion in a manner consistent with the format in concert with me adding to or supporting the discussion.

Discussion leaders have a minimum of three responsibilities:

1. Discuss required reading plus some suggested reading.
2. Hold the discussion in a manner consistent with the format. If the format is anarchy, then you are expected to consider how a meaningful dialogue would be held in an anarchic environment. You will then design a discussion format that reflects that environment and introduce and explain the format for the discussion to the class. You will then start the discussion by establishing any ground rules in addition to our general rules and lead the discussion to ensure that it is productive and follows the format. You will be intentional about ensuring that the student responsible for the campaign connection is able to participate to share their work.

Note: You are holding a discussion without the use of technology. As in, we are sitting in a circle talking to each other without phones or laptops. Prepare for the discussion accordingly.

3. Submit materials showing evidence of preparation and planning for the discussion.

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard: Complete more than one discussion leader assignment, complete each discussion leader assignment by substantially exceeding expectations, engaging in post-discussion leader reflection, and/or other proposed options. Complete outside research, interview particularly knowledgeable people, observe topics that relate to the discussion, relate

the discussion to Seguin in meaningful ways that involve the community, and other methods of holding a creative and effective discussion.

Campaign Connection

Minimum Standard: Complete at least one campaign connection assignment.

Take the country you are following and talk about the electoral campaign during as it is relevant to the class discussion. You will presumably need to:

- Create something that documents your research about the electoral campaign and how it relates to the class topic.
- Make at least two meaningful contributions to the class discussion on your assigned day that make it clear that you completed the assignment and that you are discussing the electoral campaign.

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard: Complete more than one campaign connection assignment, complete each campaign connection assignment by substantially exceeding expectations, engaging in post-campaign connection reflection, and/or other proposed options.

Participatory Budgeting

Minimum Standard: Submit material demonstrating preparation for this activity.

We will work on the participatory budgeting project for four class days. The project involves engaging in deliberation surrounding the potential to allocate \$5,000 to improve environmental sustainability at TLU. This money actually exists, and I hope to entertain completed project applications for the funding through the Nelson Fund at the conclusion of the project.

The basic outline of the four class sessions is as follows:

1. Orientation to the Nelson Fund and the participatory budgeting process.
2. Discussion of proposed projects and project designs. Preparation for participatory budgeting activity.
3. Participatory budgeting activity to decide which proposed projects to develop further through project applications.
4. Begin working on Nelson Fund project applications.

You will submit material demonstrating preparation for the participatory budgeting activity prior to the second class session. That material should include:

- A set of five or more project ideas (each to cost under \$5,000) with a brief description of each idea, why it is needed, how it benefits environmental sustainability, why it meets the standards for Nelson Fund funding, how it would be implemented, who would implement it, a rough project timeline, and what the design is of the project.
- An approach or method to present each of your ideas to the class in a meaningful and effective manner.

- A proposal for how to deliberate, discuss, and decide on which proposed projects to select (during class three) to move forward to start working on project applications (in class four).

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard: Submit material demonstrating preparation for additional class sessions beyond the second one. Continue working on the Nelson Fund project applications or other components of the participatory budgeting project after these class sessions are complete (see me if you intend to do this, and perhaps there is a group of students who wish to work together on it). Take on specific leadership roles during or after the activity. Other proposed options.

TLU Dialogue

Minimum Standard: Adequately engage and support your group.

In a small group (ideally a pair), design and lead a deliberative dialogue about a relevant issue impacting TLU students that, through dialogue and discussion, has a reasonable chance of being at least partially addressed. The dialogue should:

- Take a significant amount of time to research, develop, plan, and execute.
- Utilize key institutional knowledge from TLU and from peer institutions.
- Be structured and designed using one or more deliberative dialogue approaches appropriate for addressing the issue. Approaches include, but are not limited to those discussed in *Creating Space for Democracy: Reflective Structured Dialogue* (Essential Partners), *Dialogue to Change* (Everyday Democracy), *Sustained Dialogue* (Sustained Dialogue Initiative), *Intergroup Dialogue* (The Program on Intergroup Relations), *Story Circles* (Junebug Productions), *Deliberative Forum* (National Issues Forums), and *Exploratory Discussion* (Interactivity Foundation).
- Consist of at least one, but preferably more than one, deliberative dialogue session that you facilitate prior to the third narrative evaluation.
- Partner in a sustained and meaningful way with at least one club, organization, or office on campus in hosting the deliberative dialogue sessions.
- Recruit an adequate number of student participants who are well qualified to participate in the dialogue and who hold different perspectives on the issue.
- Result in a report to relevant stakeholders that describes the dialogue process and results and effectively articulates the conclusions from the dialogue and how they call for institutional or policy change. Present or be prepared to present this report to these stakeholders.
- Collect written evidence and documentation from research, the deliberative dialogue sessions, and reports on your findings.
- Be ready and able to report on work conducted outside of class and to perform work during class on an at least weekly basis.

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard:

To earn a grade higher than a “D” in this course, it is incumbent upon you and your partner to discuss ways to fulfill the minimum requirements listed above and to exceed the standards in numerous meaningful ways. There are almost infinite ways to do so in the scope and impact of

the project, the level of planning and documentation provided, the number and structure of deliberative dialogue sessions, the significance and amount of reflection, and the replicability and reproducibility of the process, among myriad other approaches. It is your responsibility to devise both individual and group commitments that exceed the minimum standards that you then reflect on in your narrative evaluation.

Community Dialogue

Minimum Standard: Adequately engage and support your group.

In a small group (ideally a group of three or four), design and lead a deliberative dialogue about an issue relevant to the Seguin community. The issue itself is something that the class as a whole will decide. Your group is responsible for leading a deliberative dialogue about a specific aspect of the issue that fits into the overarching goal of the project. The dialogue you and your group plan and execute should:

- Take a significant amount of time to research, develop, plan, and execute.
- Utilize key institutional knowledge about Seguin and similar cities.
- Be structured and designed using one or more deliberative dialogue approaches appropriate for addressing the issue. Approaches include, but are not limited to those discussed in *Creating Space for Democracy*: Reflective Structured Dialogue (Essential Partners), Dialogue to Change (Everyday Democracy), Sustained Dialogue (Sustained Dialogue Initiative), Intergroup Dialogue (The Program on Intergroup Relations), Story Circles (Junebug Productions), Deliberative Forum (National Issues Forums), and Exploratory Discussion (Interactivity Foundation).
- Consist of at least one, but preferably more than one, deliberative dialogue session that you facilitate prior to the third narrative evaluation.
- Recruit an adequate number of student participants who are well qualified to participate in the dialogue and who hold different perspectives on the issue.
- Result in information that the class can collate into a report to relevant stakeholders that describes the dialogue process and results and effectively articulates the conclusions from the dialogue and how they call for institutional or policy change.
- Collect written evidence and documentation from research, the deliberative dialogue sessions, and reports on your findings.
- Be ready and able to report on work conducted outside of class and to perform work during class on an at least weekly basis.
- Contribute to whole class tasks and assignments related to the dialogue including decision-making, contacting local officials and leaders, and working on common documents and procedures.

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard:

To earn a grade higher than a “D” in this course, it is incumbent upon you and your group to discuss ways to fulfill the minimum requirements listed above and to exceed the standards in numerous meaningful ways. There are almost infinite ways to do so in the scope and impact of the project, the level of planning and documentation provided, the number and structure of deliberative dialogue sessions, the significance and amount of reflection, and the replicability and reproducibility of the process, among myriad other approaches. It is your responsibility to

devise both individual and group commitments that exceed the minimum standards that you then reflect on in your narrative evaluation.

Narrative Evaluation

Minimum Standard: Complete at least three narrative evaluations.

For each narrative evaluation, reference your initial narrative, including any modifications I required such that your narrative sets you up to earn the grade you stated you intend to earn. Using that as a framework, complete the narrative evaluation with the following:

1. Write about the grade you are currently earning in the course based on your current progress.
2. Provide a narrative that covers each item and the standards you are holding yourself to such that you earn the grade you wish to earn. Each item should be listed with a header stating the item name.
 - a. For each item, include a series of questions you will use to evaluate whether you have met the standard once the item is partially or fully complete. You will use these questions in your narrative evaluations. The questions should include a mix of countable items (e.g., number, length, et. cetera) and other questions. Answer the questions.
 - b. For each item, evaluate whether you have or are on track to successfully complete the item to the standard required.
 - c. For each item not fully completed, write a plan for improvement with specific and actionable ways to do better on the item.
 - d. For each item not completed successfully, write how you have either reduced the grade you intend to earn in the course or how you have introduced additional standards for other items to get you back on track.
3. Write a concluding narrative that provides an honest, forthright evaluation of your overall progress.

Opportunities to Exceed the Standard: Complete all narrative evaluations (highly recommended!). Provide more than minimal detail in each narrative evaluation. Include particularly robust responses or action plans.

Course Policies:

- General:
 - You agree to the provisions in the Common Syllabus, available on Brightspace.
 - All assignments are to be turned in on Brightspace and are due at class time on the date indicated unless otherwise noted.
 - You are responsible for ensuring that your assignments submit to Brightspace successfully and that the file you submitted can be displayed. All file submissions except the class notes must be in Microsoft Word (.doc or .docx) or PDF format. Files in other formats --- including Google Docs --- cannot be read by Brightspace.

- Should you have an accommodation, please meet with me during the first two weeks of classes, either during office hours or by appointment, to discuss.
- Plagiarism:
 - Citations must be in American Political Science Association (APSA) style. Use of this style is important, as it governs the writing of professional political science. The APSA style manual is posted on Brightspace.
 - Book format: Grace, Philip. 2016. *Affectionate Authorities: Fathers and Fatherly Roles in Late Medieval Basel*. London: Routledge.
 - Journal article format: Walsh, Germaine Paulo. 2002. "Is Jane Austin Politically Correct? Interpreting Mansfield Park." *Perspectives on Political Science* 31(1): 15-26.
 - In-text citation format: Professors at TLU are doing interesting research (Grace 2016; Walsh 2002).
 - Plagiarism, including inappropriate attribution, is an Academic Honesty Violation and is grounds for failure from the course.
 - Always cite your sources. If you are unsure if you are paraphrasing, rewrite to use either a direct quotation or paraphrase differently. Feel free to talk to me if you are unsure whether or how to cite a source.
 - You can use the Turnitin draft coach on Word Online to run a Turnitin report.
 - Wikipedia is not an appropriate academic source.
 - Artificial intelligence tools will be of little help in this course. Only tools that assist with brainstorming concepts or basic spelling and grammar are allowed in this course. If you use one of these tools, you must cite it. All work must be wholly your own, and sentences must be constructed without assistance. All other uses are Academic Honesty Violations.
- Student Office Hours:
 - Student office hours are a time for you to come by to speak with me without an appointment. Please come by to see me early in the semester. I am happy to discuss your progress in the course, political science topics, and potential career paths. These student office hours are for you; please do not feel like you are imposing by stopping by. If you want to come by but don't know what to ask, ask me about my favorite breed of cat!
- Technology:
 - We will use technology in class, but only at designated times. As a result, you are expected to bring a laptop, tablet, or smartphone to each of our class sessions (laptop or tablet preferred). If you will not have regular access to one of these devices, you can borrow a laptop from the library, use a classmate's laptop, or speak with me and we will work out an alternative approach.
 - You are expected to use your devices for class purposes only and during designated times. Using your device in other ways is distracting to other students, and I reserve the right to deduct up to 10% of your final grade or to drop you from the class in serious cases.
 - Taking photos, recording audio/video of class, or distributing any class materials is not permitted.
- Attendance:

- I understand that there are reasons that you may need to be absent from class. I expect that you will be responsible and attend class as much as possible. Accordingly, **you do not need to let me know when you will be absent** unless it is a university sponsored absence. If you are absent, it is your responsibility to learn what we did from someone else in class, to review all material on Brightspace, and to come speak with me during student office hours if you have questions.
- Attending class is the biggest key to success in this course. **It is best to limit absences to 3 or fewer during the semester. 6 or more absences result in automatic failure from the course.**
- Late Work:
 - All assignments in this course are most relevant to you and to the rest of the students if they are turned in the day that they are due. As such, assignments will only be accepted late if prior arrangements for an extension have been made.
 - Extensions will only be given in extraordinary circumstances. Feel free to speak with me if numerous assignments are due around the same time; we can develop a plan together to help you complete everything on time. To request an extension, you must e-mail me at least 48 hours before the assignment is due with the reasons behind your request. We can then work together to figure out how you can turn the assignment in on time or make alternate arrangements in extraordinary circumstances.
- Grading:
 - Everyone can succeed in this course, and it is my goal to help you do so! Coming to class prepared, completing assignments on time, working hard, and doing your best are the biggest tickets to doing well.
 - I do not give incomplete grades unless there is a documented medical crisis or documented emergency late in the semester and you have communicated about this to me when the incident occurs.
 - There is no extra credit offered.
- Checking Your Grade:
 - This is a narrative evaluated course. You will provide your own narrative assessment of your performance.
- Contacting Me:
 - E-mail is the best way to contact me outside of student office hours. Please do not use Brightspace Messages, as I am unlikely to see your message promptly. You can call my office phone, but my e-mail response time is likely to be quicker.
 - I will respond to your e-mails promptly. In general, you can expect a response within 24 hours and that e-mails will be answered between 9AM and 5PM, Monday through Friday. While I understand students work outside of these hours, please plan ahead to give me time to respond.
 - Be sure to check the syllabus before e-mailing; questions answered in the syllabus will not be answered via e-mail.
 - Often, e-mail is best used to set-up an individual meeting. It is easier for us to understand each other in a meeting rather than via lengthy e-mail exchanges.
 - Please treat e-mails as professional correspondence. E-mails may only come from your tlu.edu e-mail address and should include a salutation (e.g., Dear Dr.

O'Brochta), a clear message, and a signature with your name and the class you are enrolled in.