

Brad Mapes-Martins, Ph.D.
bmapesma@uwsp.edu
Office: 472 Collins Classroom Center

Times: Mon. & Wed., 11:00am-12:15pm
Room: 114 Collins Classroom Center
Office Hours: Wed., 12:30-1:30pm & appointments

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course addresses contemporary ideas actively being formulated by political actors engaged in the political process or by political scientists to explain important changes. As an upper-division interdisciplinary course the approach to our topic, the learning materials selected, and the projects for assessment all combine interpretive and conceptual aspects of the humanities with the empirical and methodological concerns of the social sciences.

In spring 2017 our topic is “resilience and adaptation to climate change.” Climate change has been a source of vigorous political disagreement in the United States. General scientific agreement about the basic long-range effects of climate change have generated discussions among policy planners about how to prepare for, adapt to, and recover from some of the more damaging effects of climate change. We will seek to understand the political dynamics at work around the issue and the difficulties climate change poses for planners.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Students will ...

- demonstrate comprehension of how different ideas inform political disagreements.
 - employ interpretive skills to construct research questions.
 - apply social scientific methods for explaining political behavior.
 - analyze quantitative data as evidence in conducting research.
-

GRADING

Discussion Participation (150 points). Students are expected to contribute to class discussion in multiple ways: arriving with the assigned readings completed in advance, answering oral questions, formulating questions, listening attentively to others, and taking notes. *See Participation Grading Rubric for details.*

Response Writings (350 points = 25 points x 14 assignments). Every week, students will write a brief response to the assigned readings for the week. A hardcopy, typed response is due each week at the beginning of class on **Monday**. *Further instructions will be provided.*

Analytic Paper (200 points). The semester concludes with a 2500-3000 word paper on the course topic and drawing from the course materials. *Further instructions will be provided.*

Bonus Points (5 points each). On Wednesdays, we begin class with an opportunity to earn bonus points by briefly answering a question related to our topic. **No make-up is offered for bonus point opportunities.**

GRADE VALUES									
		B+	629 - 607	C+	559 - 539	D+	489 - 469		
A	700 - 651	B	606 - 581	C	538 - 511	D	468 - 420	F	419 or less
A -	650 - 630	B -	580 - 560	C -	510 - 490				

COURSE SCHEDULE

SCHEDULE	CLASSROOM PREPARATION <i>*The 'Preparation' portion of your Discussion Participation points requires you to complete assignments before the first class of the week.</i>
WEEK 1 01.23-01.27	TOPIC: Introduction – Climate Change as a Political Problem ASSIGNMENT:
WEEK 2 01.30-02.03	TOPIC: Development of the Climate Change Regime ASSIGNMENT: Howe, Joshua. 2014. <i>Behind the curve: Science and the politics of global warming</i> . Seattle: University of Washington Press, p. 170-196. Victor, David. 2011. “Explaining diplomatic gridlock: What went wrong?,” in <i>Global Warming Gridlock: Creating More Effective Strategies for Protecting the Planet</i> . New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 203-240.
WEEK 3 02.06-02.10	TOPIC: Explaining U.S. Climate Policy – Issue Salience and Agenda-Setting ASSIGNMENT: McCright, Aaron and Dunlap, Riley. 2003. “Defeating Kyoto: The Conservative Movement’s Impact on U.S. Climate Change Policy.” <i>Social Problems</i> , vol. 5(3): 348-373. Keller, Ann Campbell. 2009. <i>Science in Environmental Policy: The Politics of Objective Advice</i> . Cambridge: The MIT Press: 169-184.
WEEK 4 02.13-02.17	TOPIC: Explaining U.S. Climate Policy – Electoral Responsiveness ASSIGNMENT: Regan, Patrick M. 2015. “Copenhagen: The Climate Change Summit” in <i>The politics of global climate change</i> . New York: Routledge: 31-54. Vandeweerd, Clara, et al. 2016. “Climate voting in the U.S. Congress: The power of public concern.” <i>Environmental Politics</i> , vol. 25(2): 268-288. DOI:10.1080/09644016.2016.1116651
WEEK 5 02.20-02.24	TOPIC: Explaining U.S. Climate Policy – Elite Polarization ASSIGNMENT: Guber, Deborah Lynn. 2013. “A cooling climate for change? Party polarization and the politics of global warming,” <i>American Behavioral Scientist</i> 57(1): 93-115. DOI: 10.1177/0002764212463361 Liu, Xinsheng, et al. 2014. “Examining the determinants of public environmental concern: Evidence from national public surveys,” <i>Environmental Science & Policy</i> , vol. 39: 77-94. DOI: 10.1016/j.envsci.2014.02.006

WEEK 6 02.27-03.03	TOPIC: Explaining U.S. Climate Policy – Issue Salience and Media Coverage
	<p>ASSIGNMENT:</p> <p>Boykoff, Maxwell and Rajan, S. Ravi. 2007. “Signals and Noise: Mass-media Coverage of Climate Change in the USA and the UK.” <i>European Molecular Biology Organization</i>, vol. 8(3): 207- 211.</p> <p>Feldman, Lauren, et al. 2014. “The mutual reinforcement of media selectivity and effects: Testing the reinforcing spirals framework in the context of global warming.” <i>Journal of Communication</i>, vol. 64: 590-611. DOI: 10.1111/jcom.12108</p> <p>Bakaki, Zorzeta and Bernauer, Thomas. 2016. “Do global climate summits influence public awareness and policy preferences concerning climate change?” <i>Environmental Politics</i> (forthcoming). DOI: 10.1080/09644016.2016.1244964</p>
WEEK 7 03.06-03.10	TOPIC: Explaining U.S. Climate Policy – Economic and Cognitive Factors
	<p>ASSIGNMENT:</p> <p>Brulle, Robert, et al. 2012. “Shifting Public Opinion on Climate Change: An Empirical Assessment of Factors Influencing Concern over Climate Change in the U.S., 2002-2010.” <i>Climatic Change</i>, vol. 114: 169-188.</p> <p>Scruggs, Lyle and Benegal, Salil. 2012. “Declining Public Concern about Climate Change: Can We Blame the Great Recession?” <i>Global Environmental Change</i>, vol. 22(2): 505-515. DOI: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.01.002</p> <p>Ding, Ding, et al. 2011. “Support for climate policy and societal action are linked to perceptions about scientific agreement.” <i>Nature Climate Change</i>, Vol. 1 (December): 462-466. DOI: 10.1038/NCLIMATE1295</p> <p>Bernauer, Thomas and McGrath, Liam. 2016. “Simple reframing unlikely to boost public support for climate policy.” <i>Nature Climate Change</i>, (forthcoming). DOI: 10.1038/NCLIMATE2948</p>
WEEK 8 03.13-03.17	TOPIC: Increasing Climate Change Mitigating Behaviors
	<p>ASSIGNMENT:</p> <p>Heberlein, Thomas. 2012. <i>Navigating Environmental Attitudes</i>. New York: Oxford University Press: 69-89; 123-139.</p>
WEEK 9 03.27-03.31	TOPIC: Planning amidst Uncertainty – Theory and Evidence I
	<p>ASSIGNMENT:</p> <p>Tetlock, Philip. 2006. <i>Expert Political Judgement: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?</i> Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press: 67-120; 121-143.</p>
WEEK 10 04.03-04.07	TOPIC: Planning amidst Uncertainty – Theory and Evidence II
	<p>ASSIGNMENT:</p> <p>Tetlock, Philip. 2006. <i>Expert Political Judgement: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?</i> Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press: 144-163; 189-215.</p>

WEEK 11 04.10-04.14	TOPIC: Planning amidst Uncertainty – Climate Change Forecasts ASSIGNMENT: IPCC. 2014. “Summary for Policy Makers,” in <i>Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contributions of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</i> . Edited by Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland: 2-34. UNEP. 2016. <i>The Emissions Gap Report 2016</i> . United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi: 1-48.
WEEK 12 04.17-04.21	TOPIC: Planning amidst Uncertainty – Model Performance ASSIGNMENT: Silver, Nate. 2012. “A climate of healthy skepticism,” in <i>The Signal and the Noise: Why So Many Predictions Fail – but Some Don’t</i> . New York: Penguin Press: 370-411. Linkov, Igor, et al. 2014. “Changing the resilience paradigm,” <i>Nature Climate Change</i> , vol. 4(June): 407-409.
WEEK 13 04.24-04.28	TOPIC: Planning amidst Uncertainty – Strategic Alternatives ASSIGNMENT: Ackerman, Frank. 2010. “Cost-benefit analysis of climate change: Where it goes wrong,” in <i>Economic Thought and U.S. Climate Change Policy</i> . Edited by David M. Driesen. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press: 61-81. Victor, David. 2011. “Preparing for a changing climate: adaptation, geoengineering, and triage,” in <i>Global Warming Gridlock: Creating More Effective Strategies for Protecting the Planet</i> . New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 165-200.
WEEK 14 05.01-05.05	TOPIC: Planning amidst Uncertainty – Conceptualizing Adaptation ASSIGNMENT: Morrison, Clare and Pickering, Catherine. 2013. “Limits to climate change adaptation: Case study of the Australian Alps,” <i>Geographical Research</i> , vol. 51(1): 11-25. Suraje Dessai, et al. 2010. “Climate prediction: a limit to adaptation?” in <i>Adapting to Climate Change: Thresholds, Values, Governance</i> . Edited by W. Neil Adger, Irene Lorenzoni, and Karen O’Brien. New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 64-78.
WEEK 15 05.08-05.12	TOPIC: Planning amidst Uncertainty – Conceptualizing Resilience ASSIGNMENT: Renn, Ortwin and Klinke, Andreas. 2015. “Risk Governance and Resilience: New Approaches to Cope with Uncertainty and Ambiguity,” in <i>Risk Governance: The Articulation of Hazard, Politics and Ecology</i> . Edited by Urbano Fra.Paleo. New York: Springer, p. 19-41. Folke, Carl. 2016. “Resilience,” <i>Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Environmental Science</i> . DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199389414.013.8 Lenton, Timothy M. 2011. “Beyond 2°C: redefining dangerous climate change for physical systems.” <i>WIREs Climate Change</i> (Volume 2, May/June): 451-461. DOI: 10.1002/wcc.107.
WEEK 16 05.15-05.19	EXAM PERIOD Wednesday, May 17, 12:30pm-2:30pm

REQUIRED MATERIALS

For Purchase. Philip Tetlock. *Expert Political Judgement: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2006.

D2L. Materials not in the textbook are distributed through the University's learning management system (Desire2Learn). It is important you bring a printed copy of the reading to class.

POLICIES

Academic Misconduct: All UWSP policies regarding academic misconduct (e.g., plagiarism) are defined in Chapter 14 of *UWSP Community Bill of Rights and Responsibilities*. Violations may result in a failing grade for the course or disciplinary sanctions by the University.

Equal Access: If you have a challenge requiring classroom accommodation, please contact UWSP Disability Services Office with your documentation as early as possible in the semester. They will notify me confidentially of the accommodations.

PARTICIPATION GRADING RUBRIC

	Strong	Needs Development	Unsatisfactory
Listening	<input type="checkbox"/> Actively and respectfully listens to peers and instructor	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes displays lack of interest in comments of others	<input type="checkbox"/> Projects lack of interest or disrespect for others
Preparation	<input type="checkbox"/> Arrives fully prepared with all assignments completed, and notes on reading, observations, questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes arrives unprepared or with only superficial preparation	<input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits little evidence of having read or thought about assigned material
Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Comments are relevant and reflect understanding of: assigned text(s); previous remarks of other students; and insights about assigned material	<input type="checkbox"/> Comments sometimes irrelevant, betray lack of preparation, or indicate lack of attention to previous remarks of other students	<input type="checkbox"/> Comments reflect little understanding of either the assignment or previous remarks in seminar
Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Comments frequently help move seminar conversation forward	<input type="checkbox"/> Comments sometimes advance the conversation, but sometimes do little to move it forward	<input type="checkbox"/> Comments do not advance the conversation or are actively harmful to it
Frequency	<input type="checkbox"/> Actively participates at appropriate times	<input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes participates but at other times is “tuned out”	<input type="checkbox"/> Seldom participates and is generally not engaged
Grade	Description		
A	<i>Strong</i> in most categories.		
B	<i>Strong</i> in some categories but <i>Needs Development</i> in others.		
C	<i>Needs Development</i> or <i>Unsatisfactory</i> performance in most categories.		
D	<i>Unsatisfactory</i> in multiple categories.		
F	<i>Unsatisfactory</i> in nearly all categories.		

*Adapted from John Immerwahr, Villanova University, 2008.