Course Syllabus for LIS 7702 Seminar in Archival Appraisal

Site:	Welcome to LSU Online!	Printed by:	Edward Benoit
Course:	2021 Second Summer LIS 7702 for Edward Benoit	Date:	Friday, June 25, 2021, 8:52 AM
Book:	Course Syllabus for LIS 7702 Seminar in Archival Appraisal		

Description

This is the official syllabus for this course. Read it carefully! Click on any of the chapters to jump to the section you want to read.

You can print this book by clicking on the link under the Table of Contents.

Table of contents

Instructor & Course Information

LIS 7702 Seminar in Archival Appraisal (3)

Instructor: Dr. Ed Benoit, III

Phone: 225-578-1469

ebenoit@lsu.edu

Note: You can expect a response to emails within 24 hours M-F, and next business day on weekends.

Catalog description: Appraisal and selection of archival materials from both a theoretical and a practical perspective. Extensive reading in the archival literature to form familiarity with the evolution of appraisal theory and current practice in the field.

Assistance and Communication

Requests for support should be directed to the appropriate resources depending on the nature of the support requested. Please review the options below when requesting support while taking your course.

1. *Content or general course questions.* If you have questions about course content or about the course in general, use the following resources in the top section of the course:

   - the office hours listed under "Ask Your Instructor"
   - the Q & A Forum at the bottom of the section

   Read the instructions in each activity before contributing. You can expect a response to your post within 24 hours M-F, next business day on weekends.

2. *Personal progress questions.* If you have questions regarding your course progress, grades, or other issues of a personal nature, you should send an email to your course instructor. You can expect a response within 24 hours M-F, next business day on weekends.

3. *Technical questions or issues.* If you have any technical problems or questions, email the ITS Help Desk at servicedesk@lsu.edu or call them at (225) 578-3375. Be sure to include your name, course number, and section in your contact.

Course Outcomes and Module Learning Objectives

This course covers the following specific measurable outcomes and learning objectives. All assessments are aligned to these outcomes and objectives.

Course Outcomes

When you complete this course, you will be able to:

1. Compare and contrast different appraisal theories in order to apply theoretical concepts to real-world decision-making
2. Evaluate organizational policies based on theory, historical approaches, and seminal literature
3. Manage the archival appraisal process
4. Appraise records and papers for their long term retention
5. Weigh practical, professional, legal, and ethical issues in the appraisal and acquisition of archives.

Module Topics and Learning Objectives

The following is a breakdown of module topics and their associated learning objectives.

Module 1: Historic Foundations & Enduring Rifts
1. Discuss the foundations of archival appraisal theory (CO1)
2. Compare and contrast appraisal approaches to underrepresented groups (CO2)

Module 2: Policies & Collection Analysis
1. Determine factors considered in the development of an appraisal policy (CO3)
2. Examine the application of collection development policies within a real-world situation (CO5)

Module 3: Micro-appraisal & Legal/Ethical Considerations
1. Differentiate approaches towards applying micro-appraisal theories to records (CO1)
2. Explain the role of donor relations as part of the archival process (CO3)
3. Deconstruct the legal and ethical issues related to the real-world appraisal of records (CO5)

Module 4: Personal Papers & Documentation Strategy
1. Describe the documentary mission of modern manuscript collecting (CO1)
2. Compare and contrast applications of documentation strategy within archives (CO1)
3. Critically analyze real-world applications of appraisal theory to contemporary archival records (CO2)

Module 5: Deaccessioning, Macro-appraisal, & Functional Analysis
1. Explain the role of deaccessioning as part of archival management (CO3)
2. Summarize the process of applying a functional analysis approach to appraisal (CO1)
3. Support organizational decisions & strategies based on functional appraisal approaches (CO5)

Module 6: Documenting Sectors of Society
1. Discuss the role of archives in collective memory (CO5)
2. Apply appraisal approaches to a real-world collection (CO4)

Module 7: Digital & Non-textual Records
1. Illustrate the unique factors of applying appraisal theory to digital records (CO1)
2. Compare the application of appraisal theory of textual and non-textual records (CO1)

Materials and Resources

The following textbooks are required for this course:

Cook, Terry (ed.). *Controlling the Past: Documenting Society and Institutions*. Chicago: SAA, 2011.

Boles, Frank. *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts*. Chicago: SAA, 2005.

These textbooks can be purchased from the LSU Bookstore or any online book vendor. The textbooks can also be purchased through the SAA Bookstore at a discount for members.
All other required articles, videos, and other resources will be freely available and linked in the module resource books.

Technical Information

Moodle runs on Windows, Linux, iOS, Android, or any device with a web browser. For information on browsers, please visit the LSU **ITS Web Browser Recommendation** page.

Google Chrome and Firefox are the recommended browsers for Moodle 3 at LSU. We also recommend that you have Adobe Flash installed and enabled, and that Javascript is enabled.

Hardware Recommendations

The following are helpful for completing your coursework and remote testing:

- A headset with microphone
- A webcam

Printing Your Course Material

Use one of the following methods to print module content:

- See printing options using Firefox
- Use the print commands in Moodle to print full books.
- Embedded PDFs contain printing functionality.
- Select Ctrl + P from your computer's keyboard.
- If you have added a print icon shortcut on your browser's toolbar, click the icon to print content.

Grading Scale and Course Work

Your grade in this course will be determined by the specific activities and assessments described in this syllabus. In the following subchapters, you will find details about each type of activity and assessment, as well as the grade breakdown and grading scale. Specific expectations for each graded item are included within these subchapters. Make sure you read all of the instructions! Please note that all due dates and times are in Central Standard Time (CST).

Each module requires a minimum of approximately twelve to thirteen hours of in-class work (viewing and completing activities in Moodle) and approximately six to seven hours of out-of-class work (readings, research, study time). This means you will complete approximately nineteen hours of total work per module. Due to the compressed summer schedule, you will complete one module per 5 calendar days.

Special note:

Federal Financial Aid regulations require the confirmation of course participation in order for students to receive financial aid. In this course, this is achieved by documenting student completion of an academic activity by the last day to add courses for credit or change sections, which is usually the fifth day of class. This activity is designated "AEA" in Module 1. Failure to complete this activity within this time period may result in a delay in the disbursement of financial aid funds.

There is also a required academic activity due on the last day of class to ensure student engagement throughout the full term.

Grade Breakdown and Grading Scale

There are 4 components to your course grade.

- Discussion Forums
- Critical Literature Analyses
- Appraisal Exercise
- Case Studies

The grade breaks down as follows:

Grade Breakdown

Assignment Category	Grade Percentage
Discussion (4)	15%
Critical Literature Analyses	30%
Appraisal Exercise	15%
Case Studies	40%
Total	100%

GRADING SCALE

The following grading scale applies:

- 99%–100% = A+
- 94%–98% = A
- 90%–93% = A-
- 87%–89% = B+
- 84%–86% = B
- 80%–83% = B-
- 77%–79% = C+
- 74%–76% = C
- 70%–73% = C-
- 67%–69% = D+
- 64%–66% = D
- 60%–63% = D-
- 0%–59% = F

Discussion Forums

Description

In all modules, you will participate in a discussion forum where you will be required to start a discussion and then respond to at least 2 of your classmates. Click on the forum title in each module, where you will find a prompt asking you to demonstrate critical thinking about the concepts presented in the module. Each discussion forum activity (original post plus responses) is worth a maximum of 10 points. In order to make your discussion experience more manageable, you are enrolled in a smaller discussion group. You are only required to view and post to your group (and will not have access to other group's discussions).

Submission Guidelines

Your contributions should be thoughtful, concise, and address the prompt fully. Your original post should be 300-750 words long and is worth 3-5 points. Responses to other student's posts are worth 1-3 points. The maximum for the forum is 10 points.

A simple "I agree" or "Yes" or "LOL" will not count. Please think about the questions and your peers' responses and reply thoughtfully and courteously, according to netiquette rules. Use good English grammar, correct punctuation, and complete sentences. While the posts will mostly be judged by their thoughtfulness and completeness, I reserve the right to take off points for grammatical errors, especially if they interfere with the clarity of the post.

Due Dates

Posts are due by 11:55 pm CST according to the following list:
- Module 1: Original post--July 7; Responses--July 9
- Module 3: Original post--July 17; Responses--July 19
- Module 5: Original post--July 27; Responses--July 29
- Module 7: Original post--August 6; Responses--August 8 (note: the module 7 post is due at 12:00 pm (noon) on August 8)

Grading Rubric

The following rubric is a sample of what is expected in both original and response posts.

Discussion Forum Rubric

Criteria	Exceeds Expectations(5/3 pts)	Meets Expectations (4/2 pts)	Below Expectations (3/1 pts)
Critical Thinking	Posts show deep insight and analysis. Personal opinion is expressed clearly and fully developed. Poses questions or ideas to promote further discussion.	Posts are simple but show some insight and analysis. Personal opinion is expressed but lacks elaboration and detail. Offers some new line of thinking.	Posts lack insight and analysis. Simply rehashes or summarizes others' posts. It does not express opinion clearly. Posts do not inspire further thinking.
Connections	Clear connections are made through specific references to course materials (websites, articles, texts). Specific examples are used to connect concepts to personal experiences.	Connections to course materials and/or personal experiences are not specific or lack elaboration and detail.	Connections are vague and do not address both course materials and personal experiences.
Replies	Replies show insight, depth, and understanding. They connect with the original post and add to that post by including references to supporting material. Personal opinion is appropriately expressed and clearly related to the original post. Thoughtful questions were posed to further the discussion of the topic.	Replies are rather simple but show some insight, depth, or connection to the original post. Some material may be irrelevant, but personal opinion is appropriately expressed, and posts as a whole show understanding. Questions were posed to further discussion of the topic.	Simple replies that lack insight, depth, or are superficial. Entries tend to be short and frequently irrelevant to the original post. It does not express opinion clearly. Shows little understanding. No questions were posed to further the discussion of the topic.

Criteria	Exceeds Expectations(5/3 pts)	Meets Expectations (4/2 pts)	Below Expectations (3/1 pts)
Technical Details	Rules of grammar, usage, and punctuation are followed; spelling is correct. Language is clear and precise. Words are carefully chosen and used correctly, according to both their denotation and connotations. Few, if any, spelling or typographical errors.	Posts include a few grammatical, syntactical, spelling, or typographical errors. The language lacks clarity or includes the use of some jargon or conversational tone. Words are used correctly, according to denotation, but not necessarily their connotations.	Posts include numerous grammatical, syntactical, spelling, or typographical errors. Language consistently lacks clarity, sentence structure may be wordy, unfocused, repetitive, or confusing. Words are misused according to both their denotation and connotations.

Critical Literature Analyses

Module 1 Critical Literature Analysis #1

Instructions

This assignment addresses **course outcome 2 and module learning objective 2.**

 For this assignment, you write a critical literary analysis of two contemporary appraisal articles related to underrepresented groups. Your analysis must include the following:

1. Short summary of each article
2. Critical analysis of each article (strengths, limitations, methodology [if any]
3. Comparison of the two articles
4. Discussion of each article's relationship with appraisal theory and underrepresented groups

File names should be YourLastName_Lit1 and may be submitted in .doc, .docx, .rtf, or .pdf formats. Follow either Chicago (Note-Bibliography style) or APA citation style for formatting of citations and the bibliography. Remember that you must cite the source of your information, regardless of whether you quote, paraphrase, or summarize.

Critical literature analyses must be 1.5 spaced, in 12-point font, with 1-inch margins, and between 1,500-2,000 words. Submit your assignment before July 12 at 11:55 pm CST.

Available Readings

Select two from the following:

- Confronting Our Failure of Care Around the Legacies of Marginalized People in the Archives by Bergis Jules (November 11, 2016)
- No One Owes Their Trauma to Archivists, Or, the Commodification of Contemporaneous Collecting by Eira Tansey (June 5, 2020)
- Terry Cook, "Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community: Four Shifting Archival Paradigms," *Archival Science* 13 (2013): 95-120.
- Lae'l Hughes-Watkins, "Moving Toward a Reparative Archive: A Roadmap for a Holistic Approach to Disrupting Homogenous Histories in Academic Repositories and Creating Inclusive Spaces for Marginalized Voices," *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies*: 5 (2018): Article 6.
- Sara White, "Crippling the Archives: Negotiating Notions of Disability in Appraisal and Arrangement and Description," *American Archivist* 75(1) (2012): 109-124.
- S.L. Ziegler, "Digitization Selection Criteria as Anti-Racist Action," *Code4Lib* 45 (2019).

Grading

The analysis will be graded out a total of 100 points on the following criteria:
1. Requirements
2. Writing style
3. Analysis components
4. Article comparison
5. Appraisal theory

Module 4 Critical Literature Analysis #2

Instructions

This assignment addresses **course outcome 2 and module learning objective 3.**

For this assignment, you will write a critical literary analysis of two contemporary appraisal articles. Your analysis must include the following:

1. Short summary of each article
2. Critical analysis of each article (strengths, limitations, methodology [if any]
3. Comparison of the two articles
4. Discussion of each article's relationship with the real-world application of apprisal theory to records.

File names should be YourLastName_Lit2 and may be submitted in .doc, .docx, .rtf, or .pdf formats. Follow either Chicago (Note-Bibliography style) or APA citation style for formatting of citations and the bibliography. Remember that you must cite the source of your information, regardless of whether you quote, paraphrase, or summarize.

Critical literature analyses must be 1.5 spaced, in 12-point font, with 1-inch margins, and between 1,500-2,000 words. Submit your assignment before July 27 at 11:55 pm CST.

Available Readings

Select two from the following:

- John Erde, "Constructing Archives of the Occupy Movement," *Archives and Records: The Journal of the Archives and Records Association* 35(2) (2014): 77-92.
- Stacie Williams and Jarrett Drake, "Power to the People: Documenting Police Violence in Cleveland," In "Critical Archival Studies," Michelle Caswell, Ricardo Punzalan, and T-Kay Sangwand, eds., special issue, J*ournal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 1(2) (2017). https://doi.org/10.24242/jclis.v1i2.33.
- Jennifer Hale Eagle, ""I Want Them to Know We Suffer Here": Preserving Records of Migrant Detention in Opposition to Racialized Immigration Enforcement Structures," *Journal of Radical Librarianship* 5 (2019): 16-40.
- Marika Cifor, "Aligning Bodies: Collecting, Arranging, and Describing Hatred for a Critical Queer Archives," *Library Trends* 64(4) (Spring 2016): 756-775.
- Ria van der Merwe, "From a Silent Past to a Spoken Future: Black Women's Voices in the Archival Process," *Archives and Records* 40(3) (2019): 239-258.
- Krista McCracken, "Community Archival Practice: Indigenous Grassroots Collaboration at the Shingwa Residential Schools Centre," *American Archivist* 78(1) (2015): 181-191.

Grading

The analysis will be graded out a total of 100 points on the following criteria:

1. Requirements
2. Writing style
3. Analysis components
4. Article comparison
5. Appraisal theory

Case Studies

Module 2 Case Study #1 Assignment

Instructions

This assignment addresses **course outcome 5 and module learning objective 2.**

For this assignment, you will read one of two case studies on the construction of a collecting policy. Your final product will be 1,500-2,500 words, 1.5 spaced, 12-point font with 1-inch margins. Included citations using a common citation style manual.

The readings are:

Reading 1: Gloria A. Thompson, "From Profile to Policy: A Minnesota Historical Society Case Study in Collection Development," *Midwestern Archivist* 8, no. 2 (1983): 29-39.

Reading 2: Tom Hyry, Diane Kaplan and Christine Weideman, "Though this be Madness, Yet There is Method in 't": Assessing the Value of Faculty Papers and Defining a Collecting Policy," *American Archivist* 65 (Spring/Summer 2002): 56-69.

For the reading you have chosen, write a brief essay discussing the appraisal issues involved in the case study. Your essay will address the following areas:

- What were the main considerations of the case study? [a two-paragraph summary of the article at the maximum]
- What are the appraisal issues involved in the case study? How did the repositories apply their collection development policies?
- Were the appraisal issues resolved at the repository? If so, how? If not, why not? [note: this may require further research into the current collecting practice at the repositories addressed in the articles. Do not rely solely on resolutions given in the article, but expand your exploration to consider how the repository is currently functioning. Resources may include more up to date collecting policies, an analysis of online finding aids, or other descriptive tools.]
- What are your thoughts on the issues and their solutions? Were there other options?
- How does the appraisal literature support or not support the solutions?

When offering your thoughts on the issues and solutions, be sure to use examples and the literature to support your assertions. You should use the broader archival literature to support your discussion – this may include articles from class readings as well as other articles you have found in your research. There is a broad literature on appraisal, and part of the goal of these case studies is to have you examine it more fully than limited course readings allow.

File names should be YourLastName_Case1 and may be submitted in .doc, .docx, .rtf, or .pdf formats. Follow either Chicago (Note-Bibliography style) or APA citation style for formatting of citations and the bibliography. Remember that you must cite the source of your information, regardless of whether you quote, paraphrase, or summarize.

Case studies must be 1.5 spaced, in 12-point font, with 1-inch margins, and between 1,500-2,000 words. Submit your assignment before July 17 at 11:55 pm CST.

Grading

The case study will be graded out of 100 points on the following criteria.
Format & Structure (30%):

- Does the essay meet the length and format requirements?
- Does the essay include an introduction, analysis, and conclusion?
- Is the essay free of errors and is the writing style consistent with graduate work?

Content (70%):

- Does the essay identify and summarize the main considerations (2 paragraphs maximum)?
- Does the essay discuss the appraisal issues involved?
- Does the essay analyze and discuss the resolution of the issues?
- Does the essay present the author's opinion on the issues and case study solutions?
- Does the essay include literature in support of or not in support of solutions?

Module 3 Case Study #2 Assignment

Instructions

This assignment addresses **course outcome 5 and module learning objectives 2 & 3.**

For this assignment, you will read the article by Diane Kaplan, and will conduct research in the archival literature on ethical and legal issues relative to archival appraisal to find one other article for a comparative discussion.

Kaplan, Diane. "The Stanley Milgram Papers: A Case Study on Appraisal of and Access to Confidential Data Files." *American Archivist*, 59 (Summer 1996), pp. 288 – 297.

You can also access the online finding aid for these papers if you wish.

To look for a companion article, you can consult multiple resources. Two of the most useful are:

- American Archivist online
- Archivaria online – for a Canadian perspective on the issues

You might also locate articles using the standard online databases in the LSU Libraries.

Once you've chosen a second reading, write a brief essay discussing the appraisal issues involved in the case study and in the second article you have chosen. As always, when offering your thoughts on the issues and solutions, be sure to use examples and the literature to support your assertions. You may address one or multiple issues, but be sure your discussion includes:

- A full citation for the second article chosen
- A brief discussion of how your two articles relate
- A concise discussion of the appraisal issues involved in each of these articles, including the role of donor relations within repositories
- A discussion of how the appraisal issues were resolved and any different approaches that might be taken.

File names should be YourLastName_Case2 and may be submitted in .doc, .docx, .rtf, or .pdf formats. Follow either Chicago (Note-Bibliography style) or APA citation style for formatting of citations and the bibliography. Remember that you must cite the source of your information, regardless of whether you quote, paraphrase, or summarize.

Case studies must be 1.5 spaced, in 12-point font, with 1-inch margins, and between 1,500-2,000 words. Submit your assignment before July 22 at 11:55 pm CST.

Grading

The case study will be graded out of 100 points on the following criteria.

Format & Structure (30%):
- Does the essay meet the length and format requirements?
- Does the essay include an introduction, analysis, and conclusion?
- Is the essay free of errors and is the writing style consistent with graduate work?

Content (70%):

- Does the essay include the full citation for the second article?
- Does the essay discuss how the two articles relate?
- Does the essay discuss the appraisal issues involved in both articles?
- Does the essay discuss how the appraisal issues were resolved and any different approaches that might be taken?
- Does the essay include examples and literature to support assertions?

Module 5 Case Study #3 Assignment

Instructions

This assignment addresses **course outcome 5 and module learning objectives 3.**

For this assignment, you will examine the application of a system built on functional analysis that provides tools for government agencies to appraise their records.

Consider **Vermont State Archives Functional Classification System**, paying special attention to their discussion of Domains, Activities, and Record Types. Look at both the information available on the website and the attached handouts.

Using these tools as well as readings, discuss:

- How the VCLAS system meets the needs (or does not meet the needs) of government agencies applying macro-appraisal/functional analysis in the appraisal of their records.
- The impact of this system on traditional records.
- The impact of this system on electronic records.
- As always be sure to use examples and the literature to support your assertions

File names should be YourLastName_Case3 and may be submitted in .doc, .docx, .rtf, or .pdf formats. Follow either Chicago (Note-Bibliography style) or APA citation style for formatting of citations and the bibliography. Remember that you must cite the source of your information, regardless of whether you quote, paraphrase, or summarize.

Case studies must be 1.5 spaced, in 12-point font, with 1-inch margins, and between 1,500-2,000 words. Submit your assignment before August 1 at 11:55 pm CST.

Grading

The case study will be graded out of 100 pointes on the following criteria.

Format & Structure (30%):
- Does the essay meet the length and format requirements?
- Does the essay include an introduction, analysis, and conclusion?
- Is the essay free of errors and is the writing style consistent with graduate work?

Content (70%):

- Does the essay how the VCLAS system meets the needs (or does not meet the needs) of government agencies applying macro-appraisal/functional analysis in the appraisal of their records?

- Does the essay discuss the impact of this system on traditional records?
- Does the essay discuss the impact of this system on electronic records?
- Does the essay include examples and literature to support assertions?

Appraisal Exercise

Module 6 Appraisal Exercise

Instructions

This assignment addresses **course outcome 4 and module learning objective 2.**

For this assignment, you will consider the records of a now-defunct unit within the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, the Center for Children's Literature. Included in your materials are folders of materials as they arrived from the center, descriptive information from the accession, and images of materials in each folder. This is all of the information that arrived with the records. Research on the internet may help you explore the relationship of individuals involved in the center to other organizations.

You are considering these materials for inclusion in the **University of Wisconsin Milwaukee's University Archive**s.

The Assignment:

1. Complete an appraisal report (use the outline provided)
2. List materials you would like to keep – if you are keeping entire folders of materials, folder names are sufficient.
3. List materials you would like to discard – if you are discarding entire folders of materials, folder names are sufficient.

[Note: You do not need to propose an arrangement for these materials]

- Discuss your decision-making process
  - Discuss your appraisal decisions. How did the information about the collecting priorities of the UWM Archives influence your decisions? Discuss why – or why not – the materials fit into the collecting policy.
  - Discuss the value of the records. Consider all types of archival value. Did you identify records that have short-term utility but enduring value? Were there any records with long-term utility but no enduring value?
  - Discuss the process of appraising the materials. Did you make all decisions at the item level? At the folder level? Why did you decide on this level? What impact did the size of the collection have on your decision about the level of appraisal?
  - Discuss your disposition decisions. Would you discard materials? Would you offer them elsewhere? Why or why not?
- Consider appraisal policy and documenting your decisions: write a brief description of the documentation that you would create about this appraisal decision. Explain the overall policy you are using for appraisal, explain the methodology you are using, the description of the agency responsible for creating the records, and your reasons for your disposition decisions.

File names should be YourLastName_Appraisal and may be submitted in .doc, .docx, .rtf, or .pdf formats. Follow either Chicago (Note-Bibliography style) or APA citation style for formatting of citations and the bibliography. Remember that you must cite the source of your information, regardless of whether you quote, paraphrase, or summarize.

Submit your assignment before August 4 at 11:55 pm CST.

Grading

The case study will be graded out of 100 points on the following criteria.

Format & Structure (15%):

- Does the assignment include all required elements of the exercise?
- Is the assignment free of errors and is the writing style consistent with graduate work?

Content (85%):

- Does the assignment discuss the appraisal decision?
- Does the assignment discuss the value of the records?
- Does the assignment discuss the appraisal process?
- Does the assignment discuss the disposition decisions?
- Does the assignment include a description of the documentation created about the appraisal decision?

Course Policies

The following policies apply throughout your enrollment in this course. For specific questions about these policies, please contact either your instructor or the appropriate office listed in the subchapters.

Engagement and Participation

Please check into your Moodle course frequently to keep track of your work. Participation obligations involve specific points of engagement in course activities and interaction with other course members. Your active engagement in discussion forums or other required collaborative activities constitutes your participation in this course. You are expected to contribute and collaborate according to the requirements of the specific activities and assessments described in this syllabus.

Timely communication is an e-learning best practice. Check your LSU email and the News and Announcements Forum on the **welcome page** daily to make sure you do not miss any communications from your instructor or classmates. Contact the instructor in advance if you are going to miss an assignment or turn in work late. This will give the instructor sufficient time to allow for discussing an alternative schedule.

Late Work/Late Submissions

Unless students gain prior permission from the instructor for late submissions, late assignments will be penalized. Individual assignments turned in after the due date will be penalized 5% for each day turned in late.

Academic Integrity

Academic Misconduct

Students in LSU Online courses must comply with the LSU Code of Student Conduct. Academic misconduct includes but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, collusion, falsifying academic records, and/or any act designed to give unfair academic advantage to the student. Preventing academic misconduct requires learners to take ownership of their individual work for individual assignments and assessments. Learners who violate the LSU Code of Student Conduct will be referred to Student Advocacy & Accountability. For undergraduate students, a first academic violation could result in a zero grade on the assignment or failing the class and disciplinary probation until graduation. For a second academic violation, the result could be suspension from LSU. For graduate students, suspension is the appropriate outcome for the first offense.

To read more, please visit the **LSU Code of Student Conduct page**.

Plagiarism and Citation Method

It is your responsibility to refrain from plagiarizing the academic property of another and to utilize appropriate citation method for all coursework. In this class, it is recommended that you use APA or Chicago citations. Ignorance of the citation method is not an excuse for academic misconduct. Remember, there is a difference between paraphrasing and quoting and how to properly cite each respectively.

One tool available to assist you in correct citations is the "References" function in Microsoft Word. This program automatically formats the information you input according to the citation method you select for the document. This program also has the ability to generate a reference or works cited page for your document. The version of Microsoft Word with the "References" function is available in most University computer labs. A demonstration of how to use this tool is available online at the **LSU Student Advocacy & Accountability page**.

Unauthorized Assistance

All work must be completed without assistance unless explicit permission for group or partner work is given by the faculty member. This is critical so that the professor can assess your performance on each assignment. Read the syllabus and assignment directions carefully. When in doubt, e-mail your instructors or ask in a discussion forum. Seeking clarification is your responsibility as a student. Assuming group or partner work is okay without permission constitutes a violation of the LSU Code of Student Conduct.

Accessibility

A learner with a disability is entitled by law to equal access to university programs. Two federal laws protect persons with disabilities in post-secondary education: the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Pub. L. No. 93-112, as amended), the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (Pub. L. No. 101-336) and the ADA Amendments Act (Pub. L. No.110-325). LSU A&M is committed to ensuring that its websites, online courses, and all online materials are accessible to people with disabilities.

If you have accessibility needs that we can help with, visit the **LSU Disability Services page** and register for accommodations before you begin your course work. If you have questions about accessibility for specific tools and external materials used in this course, please see the "Materials and Resources" and "Technical Information and Assistance" sections in this syllabus.

Netiquette

Communication in the online classroom comes across differently than the communication we are accustomed to through academic writing and face-to-face classroom discussion. Use online etiquette guidelines like the ones listed in the document below to craft your communication.

You can also read The Core Rules of Netiquette by Virginia Shea (1994) to understand the human aspect of online communication.

It appears you don't have a PDF plugin for this browser. You can **click here to download the PDF file.**

Diversity Statement

Diversity is fundamental to LSU's mission and the University is committed to creating and maintaining a living and learning environment that embraces individual difference. Cultural inclusion is of highest priority. LSU recognizes that achieving national prominence depends on the human spirit, participation, and dedicated work of the entire university community. Through its Commitment to Community, LSU strives to create an inclusive, respectful, intellectually challenging climate that embraces individual difference in race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity/expression, age, spirituality, socioeconomic status, disability, family status, experiences, opinions, and ideas. LSU proactively cultivates and sustains a campus environment that values open dialogue, cooperation, shared responsibility, mutual respect, and cultural competence—the driving forces that enrich and enhance cutting-edge research, first-rate teaching, and engaging community outreach activities.