Academic integrity comprises the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (http://www.academicintegrity.org/ica/home.php). These values are central to the building, nurturing and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the “freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas” essential to the intellectual life of the University (see the Senate Report on Principles and Priorities). Students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the regulations concerning academic integrity and for ensuring that their assignments conform to the principles of academic integrity. Information on academic integrity is available in the Arts and Science Calendar: see Academic Regulation 1 (http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academic-calendars/regulations/academic-regulations/regulation-1) and from the instructor of this course. Departures from academic integrity include plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, facilitation, forgery and falsification, and are antithetical to the development of an academic community at Queen’s. Given the seriousness of these matters, actions which contravene the regulation on academic integrity carry sanctions that can range from a warning or the loss of grades on an assignment to the failure of a course to a requirement to withdraw from the university.

Students are advised that incomplete standing will be granted only with the permission of the chair of undergraduate or graduate studies (as appropriate) and only where there is a clear demonstration of need. Applications for “Incomplete” standing must be made in the first instance to the instructor on the form available in the General Office. The simple fact of non-submission of work does not constitute an application and will result in a grade of zero for that assignment.

Students who feel that there are reasons to have their grades reviewed should follow the steps set out in the Faculty of Arts and Science’s Regulation 11, “Review of Grades and Examinations” (http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academic-calendars/regulations/academic-regulations/regulation-11).
GRADING SCHEME:

All components of this course will receive letter grades which, for purposes of calculating your course average, will be translated into numerical equivalents using the Faculty of Arts and Science approved scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment mark</th>
<th>Numerical value for calculation of final mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F48 (F+)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F24 (F)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F0 (0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copyright of Course Materials

This material is copyrighted and is for the sole use of students registered in this course. This material shall not be distributed or disseminated to anyone other than students registered in this course. Failure to abide by these conditions is a breach of copyright, and may also constitute a breach of academic integrity under the University Senate’s Academic Integrity Policy Statement.

Students with Disabilities

Queen’s University is committed to achieving full accessibility for persons with disabilities. Part of this commitment includes arranging academic accommodations for students with disabilities to ensure they have an equitable opportunity to participate in all of their academic activities. If you are a student with a disability and think you may need accommodations, you are strongly encouraged to contact the Queen’s Student Accessibility Services (QSAS) office (formerly the Disability Services Office) and register as early as possible. For more information, including important deadlines, please visit the QSAS website at: http://www.queensu.ca/studentwellness/accessibility-services
Your course average will then be converted to a final letter grade according to Queen’s Official Grade Conversion Scale:

**Queen’s Official Grade Conversion Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Numerical Course Average (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>90-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>85-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>80-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>77-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>73-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>70-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>67-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>63-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>60-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>57-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>53-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>50-52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| F     | 49 and below                     

**Course Description**

Deliberative democracy can be understood in a number of different ways but has at its core the increased role of the citizen in democratic governance. This role is premised on the ideal of a reasoning citizen and that better quality outcomes emerge from citizens at the centre of policy-making. There is a vast range of how we define increased citizen participation in policy-making and similarly, there is a wide range of how we might understand or measure the reasoning citizen. Many of the assumptions of deliberative democrats challenge traditional ideals of the capacity of the public and more specifically the public’s ability to reason well. Are the assumptions of those twentieth century theorists who are sceptical of the public’s ability wrong? Or is deliberative democracy an impossibility or perhaps even not desirable?

This course is divided into two sections. In the first half, we unpack the theoretical foundations of deliberative democracy and attempt to determine the core values of deliberative democrats. To what flaw does deliberative democracy respond? What are the *sine qua non* that make a successful deliberative experiment? Each week in our readings we will work towards creating criteria that define deliberative democracy. In the second half of the course we will apply these criteria to case studies both within Canada and elsewhere in an attempt to see how successful the case studies are based on the criteria that we have developed.

Students will write a paper on a case study of their choosing and assess it using the principles and criteria we have identified in the first half of the course. While all the readings are
available on-line through Stauffer or sent as a PDF, one book has been ordered that is an excellent introduction to some Canadian case studies:


We will also rely on a second book as a ‘warm-up’ exercise for the beginning of each class. Copies of chapters will be provided:

Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson, *Democracy and Disagreement* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1996)

**Course Format:**

The course will follow a deliberative model where all students will be encouraged to participate and learning will be collaborative. On the first day we will decide collectively the method of evaluation using the suite of traditional evaluative tools such as a research essay, article review, participation and/or presentation.

**The Theoretical Foundations of Deliberative Democracy:**

**September 17**

**Introduction to the Course**

There is no reading but we will learn about deliberative practices by doing deliberation. So, in this first class we will discuss evaluation and class format with the class collectively deciding the mode of the class, due dates and weighting of assignments.

**TUESDAY, September 22 6 PM**

**What are the core elements of deliberative democracy?**


**September 24**

**Principles of Deliberative Democracy (Andrew)**

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 2, “The Sense of Reciprocity”, 52-95


**October 1 (Ashley)**

**Citizens’ Competence**

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 3, “The Value of Publicity”, 95-128


**The importance of Random Selection**

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 4, “The Scope of Accountability”, 128-65


Lyn Carson & Brian Martin, *Random Selection in Politics* (New York: Praeger, 1999). This is a suggested resource.

**The Practice of Deliberative Democracy**

**October 8**

How does Deliberative Democracy Work in Practice?

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 5, “The Promise of Utilitarianism”, 165-99


**Citizen Juries & Participatory Budgeting**


The *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8:2, (2012) has a special issue devoted to participatory budgeting. From this issue read Brian Wampler & Janette Hartz-karp, “Participatory Budgeting: Diffusion and Outcomes Across the World” 1-6. In addition, read one article from the “Theoretical Approaches and Founding Principles” and one from either “Global Diffusion” or “Adoption and Adaptation at the Global Level”

**October 15 or October 22**

No class

**November 5**

The Promise of Deliberative Polling

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 6, “The Constitution of Deliberative Democracy”, 199-230

**Who makes Decisions?**


**November 12**

**Citizens’ Assemblies: Promises and Perils (Trevor)**

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 7, “The Latitude of Liberty”, 230-273


**November 19**

**Criticisms of Deliberative Models (Jacob)**

Guttmann & Thompson, Chapter 8, “The Obligations of Welfare”, 273-307


Any two of the following three:


Adam Przeworski, “Deliberation and Ideological Domination” in ibid., 140-61.

James Johnson, “Arguing For Deliberation: Some Skeptical Considerations” in ibid., 161-85

November 26
Evaluating Deliberative Models (Patricia)


December 3 and TBA
Presentation of Case Studies
Course summation

In the final class we will leave some time for a roundtable discussion. We will examine the themes of the course and re-evaluate our criteria developed over the first half. This will be an opportunity to step back and examine some of the larger questions which might include the following:

Is deliberation possible?
Is deliberation desirable?

What are the conditions that lead to its success?
When does it fail?

What limitation does it respond to?