

# Course|Gen\_Ed|New-Close-Modify for request 10357

## Info

**Request:** IDH3931

**Submitter:** Law,Mark E mlaw@eng.ufl.edu

**Created:** 8/21/2015 7:38:55 AM

**Form version:** 1

## Responses

**Course Prefix and Number :** IDH 3931

**Course Title:** Policies and Practices in Scholarly Publishing

**Request Type:** Change GE/WR designation (selecting this option will open additional form fields below)

**Effective Term:** Spring

**Effective Year:** 2016

**Credit Hours :** 2

**Prerequisites:** None

**Current GE Classification(s):** None

**Current Writing Requirement Classification :** None

**One-semester Approval?:** Yes

**Requested GE Classification:** None

**Requested Writing Requirement Classification:** E2

**Type of writing skill feedback provided :** Grade

**Description of other writing skills feedback:** *No response*

# POLICIES & PRACTICES IN SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

IDHXXX (2 CREDIT HOUR) / SPRING 2016  
WRITING REQUIREMENT – E2 (2000 WORDS)  
DAYS OF WEEK/TIME  
LIBRARY WEST TBD

CHRISTINE FRUIN  
SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATIONS LIBRARIAN  
OFFICE: LIBRARY WEST 522  
PHONE: 273-2710  
EMAIL: [CHRISTINE.ROSS@UFL.EDU](mailto:CHRISTINE.ROSS@UFL.EDU)  
OFFICE HOURS: TBD

## COURSE DESCRIPTION

All fields of study require its participants to produce, disseminate and evaluate scholarship; these are essential components of the scholarly communication lifecycle. Traditionally, scholarship is distributed by its authors through commercially published journals who vet content through review by experts in the field. Publication of research requires a negotiation of the rights and interests of authors and publishers. Published research is then valued through calculation of impact factors and other metrics deriving from citation by others to the original work.

The scholarly publishing industry has undergone tremendous change in the past 15 years, however, as technologies have developed and philosophies have evolved. This course will examine the ways in which scholarly information is produced, disseminated and evaluated. Challenges and opportunities presented by the evolving world of scholarly communication will be examined, including publishing economics, copyright, peer review, open access publishing models and citation metrics. Students will have the opportunity to participate in a mock editorial/review process and to hear from guest speakers actively involved in the various stages of the scholarly communication lifecycle

## COURSE OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of this course is to prepare students to be actively engaged - as authors, reviewers and editors - in the scholarly communication process. For students who are considering graduate work and/or further careers as academics or researchers, understanding of scholarly communications is a valuable asset.

Upon completion of this course, students should be able to:

- Provide a definition for scholarly communication;
- Understand and articulate the publication process, from initial manuscript submission to final publication;

- Understand the legal relationships between author, publisher and reader in order to protect their own intellectual property rights as authors and to respect others' rights.
- Understand the strengths and weaknesses of various publishing models, including open access;
- Understand the process for selecting, editing, and preparing manuscripts for publication;
- Participate as a peer reviewer for a scholarly publication;
- Demonstrate familiarity with Open Journal Systems, an online editorial management/publishing platform (as an author and reviewer);
- Investigate the various quantitative and qualitative metrics for journals, articles, and authors;
- Create and locate researcher profiles

## TEXTS

All assigned readings for this course will be available freely online or through course reserves. There are no texts required to be purchased for this course.

## ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

### ASSIGNMENTS

#### DEBATE ON SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION TOPIC (200 POINTS)

Two areas of disagreement persist among scholarly communication stakeholders: (1) the merits of open access publishing and (2) the appropriate copyright ownership of scholarly articles. Students will be assigned to a team representing each side of these two debates (four teams total – detailed below). Each team will be expected to prepare a 5-7 minute opening statement and also prepare to rebut their opponent's arguments and answer any questions raised by the instructor or other class members.

Teams will be assigned in Week 3. Debates will be scheduled Week 8 (the week before Spring Break).

#### ***Description of Teams***

##### Merits of Open Access Publishing

**Pro Open Access Team Position:** "Open access is beneficial and necessary to the process of scholarly communication."

**Con Open Access Team Position:** "Open access is *not* beneficial or necessary to the process of scholarly communication."

##### Appropriate Copyright Ownership of Scholarly Articles

**Author Team Position:** "Authors should retain the copyright for their articles."

**Publisher Team Position:** "It is necessary and beneficial for authors to transfer copyright ownership to publishers."

#### PAPER ON SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION TOPIC & WRITING CREDIT REQUIREMENT (300 POINTS)

Each student will prepare a 2000 word paper (7-8 pages, double spaced, 12 point font) on an issue of relevance to scholarly communication. Possible topics include: open access publishing, open peer review, scholarly publishing economics, publishing ethics, author's rights, etc. Papers will be submitted twice – an initial submission through a journal publishing system and a revised submission that will incorporate changes based upon classmates' peer review. The number of peer reviewers assigned per paper and the number of papers each student will have to review will depend upon the size of the class. Ideally, there will be two peer reviewers assigned to each paper, and no more than 2 papers will be assigned to each student to review.

A minimum of 5 sources must be referenced; at least three of the sources cited must be scholarly, peer reviewed works. Citations may be in either APA or Chicago style. Feedback on the areas of evaluation will be provided by the instructor for both drafts of the paper. Papers will be evaluated according to the rubric in the "Grading" section below (p. 5 of Syllabus). Papers will be evaluated on the quality of writing and rhetorical organization; the presence of critical analysis and thought; the use and proper citation of appropriate references to support the ideas presented; and adherence to grammar and punctuation standards. The UF Writing Studio (<http://writing.ufl.edu/writing-studio/>) is committed to helping students meet their academic goals by becoming better writers and offers one-on-one consultations as well as workshops to assist you with your writing goals. The instructor also recommends Diana Hacker's A Pocket Style Manual (7<sup>th</sup> ed.) for guidance on grammar and citation.

Students will review drafts of other students work. This peer review will be blind; identities of the papers' authors will not be revealed to the reviewers. The peer review grade will be based upon the thoroughness of the peer review conducted by the student reviewer as evidenced by the quality of feedback given to the student author. Please note, grades for the first and final draft of the paper will be assessed according to the rubric below and not upon feedback received during the peer review.

Students will use the Open Journal System (OJS) in completing this assignment. OJS is a journal publishing platform that is used worldwide by open access publishers for manuscript submission, peer review, and dissemination of published works to readers. A journal site will be set up for purposes of this course and students will submit their first draft as a manuscript and will also review submitted manuscripts of classmates as a peer reviewer. Final drafts will be submitted directly to the instructor.

### **DUE DATES and POINT DISTRIBUTION**

Submit topic to instructor and receive approval – Week 3

First Draft (100 points) – Due Week 8

Peer Review (50 points) – Completed by end of Class #2, Week 12

Final Draft (150 points) – Due Week 16

### **WRITING CREDIT**

The Writing Requirement (WR) ensures students both maintain their fluency in writing and use writing as a tool to facilitate learning. To receive the writing requirement credit, a student must receive a grade of C or higher and a satisfactorily complete the writing component of this course.

---

### PRESENTATION ON PAPER (150 POINTS)

Students will present the topic of the paper written for this class. Slides or other visual aids including one page handouts are permitted and encouraged. Presentations should be 7-10 minutes in length and will be evaluated on the following criteria: organization and presentation of the topic, clarity of visual component, and responses to peer questions.

---

### METRICS: JOURNAL EVALUATION (100 POINTS)

Select a journal publishing research articles on topics related to your major field of study. You may choose a journal that only publishes online or that is published both in print and online; however, the journal must have a website that you can review for purposes of this evaluation. Complete the evaluation form (<http://> ). This assignment will be completed **in class**.

---

### METRICS: AUTHOR EVALUATION (100 POINTS)

Select a University of Florida faculty member in the department of your major field of study. Assess the faculty member's impact as an author by completing the evaluation form (<http://> ). This assignment will be completed **in class**.

---

### PARTICIPATION (150 POINTS)

Class discussion is an important component of this course, as is attendance and preparation. The grade for participation will be based upon contribution to class discussion, evidence of thorough reading of required material, attendance, and demonstration of respect for the instructor, guest speakers and peers.

## GRADING

There is a total of 1000 points available in this course. Final grades will be assigned as follows:

A	1000-950 points
A-	949-900 points
B+	899-870 points
B	869-830 points
B-	829-800 points
C+	799-770 points
C	769-730 points
C-	729-700 points
D+	699-670 points
D	669-630 points
D-	629-600 points
F	599 points or less

Information on current UF grading policies for assigning grade points can be found at <https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/grades.aspx>

### Assessment Rubric for Paper on Scholarly Communication Topic

	SATISFACTORY (Y)	UNSATISFACTORY (N)
<b>CONTENT</b>	Papers exhibit at least some evidence of ideas that respond to the topic with complexity, critically evaluating and synthesizing sources, and provide at least an adequate discussion with basic understanding of sources.	Papers either include a central idea(s) that is unclear or off- topic or provide only minimal or inadequate discussion of ideas. Papers may also lack sufficient or appropriate sources.
<b>ORGANIZATION AND COHERENCE</b>	Paragraphs exhibit at least some identifiable structure for topics, including a clear thesis statement but may require readers to work to follow progression of ideas.	Paragraphs lack clearly identifiable organization, may lack any coherent sense of logic in associating and organizing ideas, and may also lack transitions and coherence to guide the reader.
<b>ARGUMENT AND SUPPORT</b>	Paper presents persuasive and confident presentation of ideas, strongly supported with evidence. At the weak end of the Satisfactory range, paper may provide only generalized discussion of ideas or may provide adequate discussion but rely on weak support for arguments.	Paper makes only weak generalizations, providing little or no support, as in summaries or narratives that fail to provide critical analysis.
<b>STYLE</b>	Paper uses a writing style with word choice appropriate to topic selected. Sentences should display complexity and logical sentence structure. At the weak end of the Satisfactory range, papers will display a less precise use of vocabulary and an uneven use of sentence structure or a writing style that occasionally veers away from word choice or tone appropriate to the topic.	Paper relies on word usage that is inappropriate for the topic selected. Sentences may be overly long or short with awkward construction. Consistent incorrect use of terminology.
<b>MECHANICS</b>	Papers will feature correct or error-free presentation of ideas. At the weak end of the Satisfactory range, papers may contain some spelling, punctuation, or grammatical errors that remain unobtrusive so they do not muddy the paper's argument or points.	Papers contain so many mechanical or grammatical errors that they impede the reader's understanding or severely undermine the writer's credibility.

## WEEKLY SCHEDULE

---

### WEEK ONE – JANUARY 4, 2016

**Topics:** Introduction to the Course. Overview of the scholarly communication lifecycle; history of scholarly publishing

**Readings:** Course Syllabus  
Alma Swan. "Overview of scholarly communication." In, Jacobs, Neil (ed.) *Open Access: Key Strategic, Technical and Economic Aspects* (Chandos 2006). <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/262427/>  
Carol Tenopir and Donald W. King. "History of Traditional and Electronic Scientific Journal Publishing." *Towards Electronic Journals: Realities for Scientists, Librarians and Publishers*, (SLA 2000): 55-82.

---

### WEEK TWO – JANUARY 11, 2016

**Topics:** Scholarly Publishing Models – types of scholarly publishing, how scholarly publishing models are changing, differences across disciplines

**Readings:** Richard Zeldin. "Differentiation of Publishing by Class of Publication." In Abel, Richard (ed) *Scholarly Publishing* (Wiley 2002): 41-45.  
Christine Borgland. "Disciplines, Documents, and Data." In *Scholarship in the Digital Age* (MIT Press 2007): 179-226.

---

### WEEK THREE – JANUARY 18, 2016

**Topic:** Scholarly Publishing Stakeholders and Economics – business of publishing and who are interested/affected parties (commercial publishers, scholarly societies, university presses, authors, libraries, instructors, students, general public, etc.)

**Readings:** Heather Morrison. "Publishing: the scholarly mission, and the multi-billion-dollar industry." In *Scholarly Communication for Librarians* (Chandos 2009): 35-56.

Cass T. Miller and Julianna C. Harris. "Scholarly Journal Publications: Conflicting Agendas for Scholars, Publishers, and Institutions." *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*. 2004. 35:2, 73-91.  
[http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal\\_of\\_scholarly\\_publishing/v035/35.2miller.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_scholarly_publishing/v035/35.2miller.html).

OPTIONAL: Cecile M. Jagodzinski. "The University Press in North America: A Brief History." *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*. 2008. 40:1, 1-20.  
[http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal\\_of\\_scholarly\\_publishing/v040/40.1.jagodzinski.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_scholarly_publishing/v040/40.1.jagodzinski.html)

**Guest Speaker:** Stakeholder Representatives (Meredith Babb, University Press of Florida; Alicia Wise, Elsevier)

**DUE:** **Paper Topic**  
**Scholarly Communication Debate Teams Assigned**

---

WEEK FOUR – JANUARY 25, 2016

- Topic: Open Access I – definition of open access, international declarations on open access, green vs. gold, impact of open access
- Readings: Peter Suber. “What is Open Access.” In *Open Access*. (MIT Press 2012): 1-27.  
[http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/9780262517638\\_Open\\_Access\\_PDF\\_Version.pdf](http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/9780262517638_Open_Access_PDF_Version.pdf)
- Budapest Open Access Initiative <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>
- Berlin Declaration <http://openaccess.mpg.de/Berlin-Declaration>
- Peter Suber. “Varieties.” In *Open Access*. (MIT Press 2012): 52-65 (note – this is only part of the chapter).  
[http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/9780262517638\\_Open\\_Access\\_PDF\\_Version.pdf](http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/9780262517638_Open_Access_PDF_Version.pdf)
- Kristin Antelman. “Do Open Access Articles Have a Greater Research Impact?” *College & Research Libraries*. 65:5, 372-382. <http://crl.acrl.org/content/65/5/372.full.pdf+html>

---

WEEK FIVE – FEBRUARY 1, 2016

- Topic: Open Access II – benefits and challenges of open access, open access policies, open access beyond scholarly literature (open data, OER, open government, etc.)
- Guest Speaker: Peter Suber (via Skype)
- Readings: Student’s Perspective on Why Open Access is Important – Right to Research Coalition  
<http://www.righttoresearch.org/learn/whyOA/index.shtml>
- Peter Suber. “Casualties.” In *Open Access*. (MIT Press 2009): 149-161.  
[http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/9780262517638\\_Open\\_Access\\_PDF\\_Version.pdf](http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/9780262517638_Open_Access_PDF_Version.pdf)
- Steffan Bernius et al. “Open Access Models and their Implications for the Players on the Scientific Publishing Market.” *Economic Analysis and Policy*. 2009. 39:1, 103-116.  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S031359260950046X>
- Clifford Lynch. Improving Access to Research Results: Six Points (2006) (post PDF)
- Kate Worlock, “The Pros and Cons of Open Access.” Nature Web Focus on Access to the Literature. <http://www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/34.html>
- Peter Suber. “Open Access: six myths to put to rest.” *The Guardian*. October 21, 2013.  
<http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2013/oct/21/open-access-myths-peter-suber-harvard>



---

WEEK SIX – FEBRUARY 8, 2016

Topic: Copyright – author’s rights, publication agreements and addenda

Readings: Copyright Ownership: Who Owns What? <http://fairuse.stanford.edu/overview/faqs/copyright-ownership/>

Charles W. Bailey, Jr. “Author’s Rights, Tout de Suite.” <http://www.digital-scholarship.org/ts/authorrightrights.pdf>

Authorship and Ownership in U.S. Copyright Law – FAQ from the Authors Alliance  
<http://www.authorsalliance.org/2014/05/20/authorship-and-ownership-faq/>

SPARC Author Rights brochure on using publication agreement addendums  
[http://www.sparc.arl.org/sites/default/files/SPARC\\_AuthorRights2006\\_0.pdf](http://www.sparc.arl.org/sites/default/files/SPARC_AuthorRights2006_0.pdf). Also look at the actual addendum at [http://www.sparc.arl.org/sites/default/files/Access-Reuse\\_Addendum.pdf](http://www.sparc.arl.org/sites/default/files/Access-Reuse_Addendum.pdf).  
By way of another example, see model language proposed at  
<https://authorrightrights.wordpress.com/model-language/>

---

WEEK SEVEN – FEBRUARY 15, 2016

Topic: Publication Process – article submission, peer review, editing; introduction to Open Journal System (OJS)

Readings: Tonette Rocco et al. “Publishing in Peer-Reviewed and Nonrefereed Journals: Processes, Strategies, and Tips” In *The Handbook of Scholarly Writing and Publishing*. (Jossey Bass 2011), 13-25.

PKP School: Writing for Publication. Module 4: Getting Published.  
<http://pkpschool.sfu.ca/writing-for-publication/module-4/>

You are responsible for the Introduction (please watch the 25 minute video linked in the introduction) and Units 1-3 (you **do not** need to do the activities at the end of the Units)

PKP School: Becoming a Reviewer. Module 4: Writing Good Reviews  
<http://pkpschool.sfu.ca/becoming-a-reviewer/module-4/>

Please skim some of the Readings at the end of the module about how to be a good reviewer. You **do not** need to do the Activity at the end of the module.

David Solomon. “The Role of Peer Review for Scholarly Journals in the Information Age.” *Journal of Electronic Publishing*. 2007. 10:1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0010.107>

---

WEEK EIGHT – FEBRUARY 22, 2016

Topic: Scholarly Communication Debates

Readings: NONE

**DUE: First Draft of Scholarly Communication Topic Paper – Submitted to OJS by 5:00 PM on xxx**

---

WEEK NINE – FEBRUARY 29, 2016 – SPRING BREAK

No Class

---

WEEK TEN – MARCH 7, 2016

Topic: Publication Ethics

Guest Speaker:

Readings: United States Office of Research Integrity. "Reporting and Reviewing Research." In *Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research*, 129-142.

<https://ori.hhs.gov/images/ddblock/rcrintro.pdf>

PKP School: Writing for Publication. Module 2: Ethics

<http://pkpschool.sfu.ca/writing-for-publication/module-2/>

You are responsible for the Introduction (including the brief video) and Units 1-6. You **do not** need to do the activities at the end of the Units.

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Tutorial on Publication Ethics – please complete all sections. <http://publicationethics.org/resources/elearning/introduction-publication-ethics-0>

COPE Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors.

<http://publicationethics.org/files/Code%20of%20Conduct.pdf>

**DUE: Peer Review Assignments Made**

---

WEEK ELEVEN – MARCH 14, 2016

Topic: Metrics I – introduction to the various types of measuring impact of scholarly publications (articles and journals) and author impact

Readings: Citation Analysis: Measuring the Influence and Impact of Research.

<http://guides.uflib.ufl.edu/citeanalysis>

Read look through the pages on this guide I have created.

London School of Economics and Political Science – Impact Blog Introduction to Measuring Research Impact <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/introduction/>

Robin Chin Roemer and Rachel Borchardt. "From bibliometrics to altmetrics: A changing scholarly landscape." *College & Research Libraries News*. 2012. 73:10, 596-600.

<http://crln.acrl.org/content/73/10/596.full>

**DUE: Journal Evaluation (In Class)**

---

WEEK TWELVE – MARCH 21, 2016

Topic: Metrics II – altmetrics and researcher profiles

Guest Speaker: Jason Priem or Heather Piwowar or J. Britt Holbrook

Readings: Jason Priem and Bradley Hemminger. “Scientometrics 2.0: Toward new metrics of scholarly impact on the social Web.” *First Monday* 2010. 15:7.

<http://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2874/2570>

Finbar Galligan & Sharon Dyas Correia. “Altmetrics: Rethinking the Way We Measure.” *Serials Review*. 2013. 39:1, 56-61. (post to course reserves)

**DUE: Peer Review  
Author Evaluation (In Class)**

---

WEEK THIRTEEN – MARCH 28, 2016

Topic: Public Access – importance of public access to research; governmental and funder mandates; institutional and other publicly accessible repositories

Readings: John Willinsky. “Public.” In *The Access Principle* (MIT Press 2006): 111-126.

[http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/content/9780262512664\\_Download\\_the\\_full\\_text.pdf](http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/content/9780262512664_Download_the_full_text.pdf)

White House Office of Science and Technology Policy Memo on Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research , February 22, 2013.

[https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp\\_public\\_access\\_memo\\_2013.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf)

Stevan Harnad. “Waking OA’s ‘Slumbering Giant’: The University’s Mandate to Mandate Open Access.” <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/267298/3/giantpaper1.pdf>.

Raym Crow. “The Case for Institutional Repositories” – excerpts from the full paper.

[http://www.sparc.arl.org/sites/default/files/media\\_files/instrepo.pdf](http://www.sparc.arl.org/sites/default/files/media_files/instrepo.pdf)

Video about the IR@UF <http://ufdc.ufl.edu/AA00026849/00001>

---

WEEK FOURTEEN – APRIL 4, 2016

Topic: Scholarly Communication Paper Presentations

Readings: NONE

---

WEEK FIFTEEN – APRIL 11, 2016

Topic: Scholarly Communication Paper Presentations and Course Wrap-Up/Evaluation

Readings: NONE

**DUE: Final Draft - Scholarly Communication Topic Paper**

## COURSE POLICIES

### PARTICIPATION AND ATTENDANCE

Regular attendance and active participation are crucial. The bulk of our time will be spent talking and engaging together with the course material and with each other's ideas. In order to do this, it is essential that you come to class prepared to address the day's material. This means completing all reading before class and being prepared to discuss the reading thoughtfully. You should have interpretations, questions, and responses to share with the class, and you should be prepared to offer these and to be called on in our conversation. Discussion and work in class are important parts of this course, so active, thoughtful participation will have an impact on your final grade.

In this course we will follow a strict attendance policy. No more than three unexcused absences will be permitted in this course; more than three unexcused absences will result in failure in the course. Absences for illness, religious holidays, and university sponsored-events are excused in accordance with University policy. See <https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/attendance.aspx>.

Please Note: If you are absent, it is your responsibility to make yourself aware of all due dates and required work. If absent due to a scheduled event, you are still responsible for turning assignments in on time.

Tardiness: Being late is disruptive, so try to always be on time. Three incidents of tardiness will count as one unexcused absence.

### CLASSROOM CONDUCT

Be polite and courteous—to me and to each other: engaging in civil debate; do not talk over each other or while someone else is talking; stay awake during class; and refrain from using any electronic devices (e.g. smartphones, tablets, iPods, etc.)

### ASSIGNMENT MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITIES

You are responsible for maintaining copies of all work submitted in this course and retaining all returned, marked work until the semester is over. Should the need arise for a resubmission of papers or a review of marked papers, it is your responsibility to have and to make available this material.

### LATE WORK POLICY AND MODE OF SUBMISSION

Assignments must be submitted according to the individual instructions for each assignment. Late submissions will not be accepted. I may consider extenuating circumstances, but you must contact me at least twenty-four hours before the assignment is due. All assignments and postings should be polished and presented in a professional manner.

### STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Students with disabilities requesting accommodations should first register with the Disability Resource Center (352-392-8565, [www.dso.ufl.edu/drc/](http://www.dso.ufl.edu/drc/)) by providing appropriate documentation. Once registered, students will receive an accommodation letter which must be presented to the instructor when requesting accommodation. Students with disabilities should follow this procedure as early as possible in the semester.

#### STATEMENT CONCERNING SEXUAL HARASSMENT

UF provides an educational and working environment that is free from sex discrimination and sexual harassment for its students, staff, and faculty. For more about UF policies regarding harassment, see: <http://www.hr.ufl.edu/eeo/sexharassment.htm>.

#### STATEMENT CONCERNING COURSE EVALUATIONS

Students are expected to provide feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing online evaluations at <https://evaluations.ufl.edu>. Evaluations are typically open during the last two or three weeks of the semester, but students will be given specific times when they are open. Summary results of these assessments are available to students at <https://evaluations.ufl.edu/results/>.

#### STATEMENT CONCERNING ACADEMIC HONESTY

All students must abide by the Student Conduct and Honor Codes. Plagiarism is a serious violation of the Student Honor Code. The Honor Code prohibits and defines plagiarism as follows: A student shall not represent as the student's own work all or any portion of the work of another. Plagiarism includes but is not limited to:

- a.) Quoting oral or written materials, whether published or unpublished, without proper attribution.
- b.) Submitting a document or assignment which in whole or in part is identical or substantially identical to a document or assignment not authored by the student.

University of Florida, Student Honor Code, <https://www.dso.ufl.edu/sccr/process/student-conduct-honor-code/>