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**Description of Course Content:** This core doctoral-level course on theory and model building in social work will support other courses in the core curriculum including those on quantitative and qualitative research methods, and the research practicum and dissertation seminars.

The purpose of this course is to prepare students to perform application and critical analysis of social science and social work theory and theory-driven research. The course involves students in integrating theory, research, and social work practice with the goal of producing models of interventions, programs, and policies. Thus, the course gives special emphasis on ways in which theory informs social work research, with a view to preparing students for their doctoral qualifying exam in the theory area (see pages 10-11 of the PhD Manual), for the design of their dissertation study, and for their development as a social work educator.

Further, since social work is a values-based and social justice-committed profession, the course guides students in integrating their own values and the values and mission of the social work discipline into their work with models of practice. Practice is defined as social work praxis in any of the domains in which social workers have a presence, including direct practice, groupwork, community organization, community/social development, organizational development and management, political action/legislation, and policy-making. Students will be encouraged to examine their own areas of practice expertise in the light of the issues discussed. These may later be the settings/topics for their dissertation research. The twin philosophical pillars of this school of social work, evidence-informed practice and empowerment (see definitions below), will be emphasized.

**Definition of Evidence-Informed Practice:**

Evidence-informed practice (EIP) is a guiding principal for the UTA-SSW. This approach is guided by the philosophy espoused by Gambrill (2006) and others who discuss evidence-based practice (EBP). Though many definitions of EIP/EBP saturate the literature, we offer two definitions that most closely define our understanding of the concept and serve to explicate our vision of EIP for the UTA-SSW:

The use of the best available scientific knowledge derived from randomized, controlled outcome studies, and meta-analyses of existing outcome studies, as one basis for guiding professional interventions and effective therapies, combined with professional ethical standards, clinical judgment, and practice wisdom (Barker, 2003, p. 149).

…..the integration of the best research evidence with our clinical expertise and our patient’s unique values and circumstances (Strauss, et al. (2005).

**Definition of Empowerment:**

Asdefined by Barker (2003:142):

In social work practice, the process of helping individuals, families, groups, and communities increase their personal, interpersonal, socioeconomic, and political strength and develop influence toward improving their circumstances.

The UTArlington SSW vision statement states that the “School’s vision is to promote social and economic justice in a diverse environment.”  Empowerment connects with the vision statement because, as Rees (1991) has pointed out, the very objective of empowerment is social justice.  Empowerment is a seminal vehicle by which social justice can be realized.  It could well be argued that true social justice cannot be realized without empowerment. Empowerment, anchored with a generalist base, directs social workers to address root causes at all levels and in all contexts, not simply “symptoms”.  This is not a static process but an ongoing, dynamic process, a process leading to a greater degree of social justice and equality.

**Student Learning Outcomes:**

1. Understand the application of the scientific process to social work theory development, including the role of theory-driven research in evidence-informed social work practice.

2. Understand the concepts and constructs of scientific inquiry (e.g. theory, assumptions, propositions, hypotheses, theorems, induction, deduction, empiricism, paradigms, models, frameworks, theory building, reason, rationality, logic, theory testing, description, explanation, prediction, causality, correlation) and the related distinctions among theories at different levels of abstraction and scope and between explanatory theories and practice theories and models.

3. Understand the standpoint and application of theories in the context of power, gender, ethnicity, race, age, ability, socioeconomic status, spatiality, culture, and history.

4. Understand the issues that contribute to gaps among research, theory and social work practice.

5. Begin to advance theoretical knowledge with the potential to bridge these gaps.

6. Analyze and compare theories and models on multiple dimensions including their ethical, ontological, and epistemological bases.

7. Synthesize evidentiary sources and concepts to modify existing models of practice and create one’s own models of practice.

8. Acquire knowledge and skills adequate to pass the doctoral qualifying exam in the theory area.

9. Acquire knowledge and skills in the relevant and appropriate use of theory to prepare and defend a dissertation proposal and dissertation.

**Required Textbooks and Other Course Materials:**

***Textbooks, Required:***

Robbins, S.P., Chatterjee, P., & Canda, E.R. (2012). *Contemporary*

*human behavior theory: A critical perspective for social*

 *work* (3rd ed.)*.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

###### Lemert, Charles, Editor (2013)*. Social Theory: The multicultural and classic readings*

######  (5th ed.). Boulder: Westview Press.

***Required materials:***

**One electronic response pad**, aka clicker (**i>Clicker)**, available at the University Bookstore. Pre and posttests, conceptual reviews to prepare for qualifying exams, and some participation exercises will be done using clickers. These activities will also constitute a demonstration of one type of classroom technology which is increasingly being used in higher education instruction.

**One poster** (cost generally < $5) produced in the Central Library Digital Media Studio (Basement) to serve as a presentation aid for an oral presentation assignment of your choice, in lieu of PowerPoints or an annotated outline. The poster must meet the dimension specifications for the university’s Annual Celebration of Excellence by Students (ACES) held each spring. Instructions may be found at the ACES webpage: <http://www.uta.edu/aces/>

Alternatively, if you have a target professional conference to which you intend to submit a poster abstract, you may follow the dimension specifications for that conference; if so, please notify me in advance of the assignment due date of that change to the required materials.

***Textbooks, Suggested*:**

Ritzer, G. (2013). Modern Sociological Theory (9th ed.).  New York: McGraw-Hill.

***Reference book:***

Jaccard, J. & Jacob, J. (2010). *Theory construction and model-building skills: A practical guide for social scientists.* New York: Guilford.

Note on availability: The suggested textbook, like the required textbooks and clicker, is available for purchase at the University Bookstore. The reference book is available free through Interlibrary Loan (see the Central Library webpage for the electronic request form); ISBN-10: **1606233394** | ISBN-13: **978-1606233399**

***Other Supportive Materials, Suggested*:**

Szuchman, L. and Thomlinson, B. (2011) W*riting with Style: APA Style for Social Work.* (4th Ed.).Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

**Descriptions of major assignments and examinations with due dates:**

**Course Requirements:** (This syllabus should be followed if different than any dated online material).Continuing the course after distribution and review of the syllabus constitutes informed consent to participate in the course, per syllabus criteria. In addition to assignments listed below, each student is expected to read 100% of the assigned reading material and to come to each class prepared to discuss (e.g., ask and answer relevant questions) the reading material. All written assignments are to be done using APA Style and submitted via SafeAssign in BlackBoard before the start of class on the day it is due.

**Assignments: 1. Social work journal study conference abstract and poster with brief oral presentation: 25 points** (**learning outcomes #3,4,6,7**) – Teams of students will be assigned a disciplinary social work journal (see Thyer, B. [2005]. A note from the editor: A comprehensive listing of social work journals. *Research on Social Work Practice, 15,* 310-311) for review.

The journals selected are *The Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research* (review 4 years: 2010-2013 at http://www.jsswr.org/issue/archive), *Research on Social Work Practice* (review 3 years: 2011, 2012, 2013)*,* and *British Journal of Social Work* (review 3 years: 2011, 2012, 2013). Please note that the number of volumes to cover varies by journal assigned, since some journals have more issues per year and/or include more articles per issue.

1. Prepare a table displaying: frequency of empirical articles in the journal for the reference years, with proportion quantitative exclusively, qualitative exclusively or mixed methods; frequency of articles that identify an explicit underlying theoretical base which is used to frame the research question, shape data collection and analysis, and interpret results.
2. Prepare a second table listing the reported theoretical frameworks, including number of articles that reference each theory and the number of empirical articles that made no mention of an explicit theory.
3. Prepare an ACES (Annual Celebration of Excellence by Students) abstract (<http://www.uta.edu/aces/help/abstracts.php>) and poster (<http://www.uta.edu/aces/help/posters.php>)discussing your findings, including your analysis of patterns of methodology type and use of explicit theories. The abstract and poster should include an introduction (purpose), methods (your review procedures), results (including your summary tables), discussion (your analysis and conclusions), limitations, and implications for further review. The ACES-format poster can be designed and printed/produced in the Digital Media Studio of the Central Library, allowing 2 days minimum (in by 3 p.m., out by 3 p.m. the next day).
4. The assignment includes a brief in-class oral presentation of the paper poste, which you will also post in electronic form in the Discussion Board section of BlackBoard. The ACES poster grading rubric is posted in BlackBoard. It is expected that abstracts will be submitted in February to ACES. **Due by beginning of class 4, with poster presentations (approximately 20 minutes) done in class that day by each team.**

**2. Theory and Model-Building 12-15 page Paper, Part 1: 25 points (learning outcomes #1,2,3,4.8,9)** – Select a significant social work theory and do a critical analysis of it, using the Robbins, Chatterjee, and Canda text’s 6-point framework for theory analysis, and using primary source materials and your own thoughtful analysis. The analysis will include the theory’s history, including significant changes in or of development the theory over time, and definitions of key theoretical concepts, as well as a discussion on how these concepts have been integrated and applied in explanatory models of the interaction between human behavior and environment. The paper grading rubric is posted in BlackBoard. **Due class 7.** The instructor will be pleased to review and comment on drafts if presented by class 5.

**3. Theory and Model-Building 8-10 page Paper with Presentation, Part 2: 25 points (learning outcomes #4,5,6,7,8,9)** – Use the theory from Part I to develop an explanatory model for a social problem or issue; you may analyze an existing model of practice, modify an existing model of practice, or create a new model of practice. Select another theoretical perspective and provide a contrasting or complementary view of the social problem or issue. Provide enough analysis of the second theory (including principles and key concept definitions) to make the comparative analysis, and the implications for the explanatory model, clear; less depth is expected than for your first theory analysis in Part I. The assignment includes a full conference-level (i.e., approximately 45-60 minutes including questions and discussion) oral presentation with guided class discussion. Presentation aids may consist of PowerPoints, electronic version of poster, or an outline, plus two relevant non-textbook readings, posted to BlackBoard one week prior to the presentation, as well as the same PowerPoints, paper poster, or outline used during the presentation. One of the readings may be descriptive, while the other must either analyze a social issue using your model or use your model as the theoretical base in an empirical study (or the theoretical perspective on which it is based if you created a new model). The paper and presentation grading rubric is posted in BlackBoard. **Due class 11, with presentations scheduled from classes 12-13.**

**4. Practice 5-7 page Qualifying Exam in the Theory Area with Presentation: 25 points (learning outcome #8)** – This assignment is an opportunity for a “dress rehearsal” for completion of the theory component of the qualifying exam (see pages 10-11 of the PhD Manual). The class will be assigned an article that represents an exemplary example of theory-driven research, including data and analysis that tests a theoretically-based model. Unlike the actual qualifying exam, time will be given in class starting in November, to work together on your paper, in addition to the individual work you do outside of class, and you will be allowed to use all course materials to craft your analysis (but no external materials, such as publications identified through database searches). The paper will include: statement and significance of the problem, including statement of the main research question; theoretical perspective(s), including major principles and concepts; conceptual/empirical model derived for testing in the form of a figure/diagram that specifies the hypothesized linkages among the components; definitions of key variables in the model; discussion of how the model fits the available data, thus evaluating the empirical support for the theoretical model; recommendations for refining the theoretical model to improve fit with the research question and data for future testing, including the integration of alternative explanatory theories; and implications for social work practice.

The assignment includes a brief oral presentation (with PowerPoints, electronic poster, or an outline posted to BlackBoard prior to the presentation as well as the same PowerPoints, paper poster, or outline used during the presentation). The paper grading rubric is posted in BlackBoard. **Due class 14, with presentations (approximately 20 minutes) done in class 15 in the form of a panel.** You will be demonstrating critical thinking skills identified in Bloom’s taxonomy:

1. Interpretation 4. Analysis

2. Synthesis 5. Application

3. Comprehension 6. Evaluation

**Course Grading Scale:**

 The following scale will be used for calculating an overall course grade:

 Grade Percentage Points

 A 100% - 90% 100 - 90

 B 89% -80% 89 - 80

 C 79% -70% 79 - 70

 D 69% - 60% 69 - 60

 F 59% and below 59 - 0

 **Grading Policy:** Assignment 1 25%

 Assignment 2 25%

 Assignment 3 25%

 Assignment 4 25%

 -----

 100%

**Course Schedule and Readings:**

  **Course Outline/Topics and Readings.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Class 1*Model Development and Theory Analysis: Science and Social Work Practice Introductions and Overview of Syllabus and Course HBSE ungraded pretest using clickersReview of the evidence-informed process for identifying and evaluating evidence for practiceToward a paradigm of social workDyads assigned journals for Assignment 1  | **Discussion:** Personal views of social work and connection to course  Most influential theories/models on your perspectives on social problems  **Required reading (and *recommended readings*):** BlackBoard Course Content Folder for Class 1Robbins Chapter 1Lemert Introduction and Part 3-Mills*Ritzer Chapters 1-2* |
| *Class 2* Social Work Knowledge and the Philosophy of Science: Frameworks for Theory Analysis |  **Required reading:***BlackBoard Class 2*Robbins Chapters 1 and 14Lemert Introduction and Final NotesRitzer Appendix*Jaccard Part 1* |
| *Class 3*Developing new knowledge: The relationship between theory and researchSystems and Conflict Theories: A study in contrasts | **Required reading:**BlackBoard Class 3 Robbins Chapters 2-4Lemert Part 1-Marx, Engels, Addams, Durkheim, Weber Parts 2-3 Parsons and Merton*Ritzer Chapters 3-5**Jaccard Chapters 4-5* |
| *Class 4*Developing new knowledge: The relationship between theory, research, and evidence-based practiceSystems and Conflict Theories, continuedEmpowerment Direct Practice Model | **Assignment 1 due; oral presentations in class** **Required reading:***BlackBoard Class 4* Robbins Chapters 4-5 Lemert Parts 1-5-DuBois, Gilman, Cooper, Simmel, Woolf, Gandhi, Mao, de Beauvoir, MLK, SDS, Friedan, Habermas, Smith, Chodorow, Foucault, James,  Hartsock, Collins, Anzaldua, Butler, Allen *Ritzer Chapters 9 and 14*  *Jaccard Chapter 6* |
| *Class 5 online*Exemplar Research Processes that Fit Social Work: Community Participatory Action ResearchMixed Methods Research and Research SynthesesLogic ModelingReflexivity and Praxis: Transformative Research and Evaluation ModelSymbolic Interaction and Acculturation Theories | **Draft of Assignment 2 for instructor review and comment is due (optional)****Required reading:***BlackBoard Class 5* Robbins Chapters 6 and 10 Lemert Parts 2, 4, 5-Mead, Althusser, Horkheimer & Adorno, Riesman, Cesaire, Fanon, Wallerstein, Goulder, Garfinkle, Asante, West, Gates, Minh-ha *Ritzer Chapter 6* |
| *Class 6*Causal Models and Why They are Important in Social Work ResearchPositivism and Constructivism with Implications for Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Research in Social Work | Librarian John Dillard will demonstrate how to use the ProQuest Dissertation database for the discussion of dissertation use of theory in class 7**Required reading:**Pick a dissertation from the ProQuest database and read theory sections for class 7 discussion*BlackBoard Class 6*Robbins Chapter 11Lemert Parts 1-5-Cooley, Goffman, Lacan, Berger & Luckmann, Baudrillard, Alexander, Weeks*Jaccard Chapter 7 and 8* |
| *Class 7*Mixed Methods Research and Model-BuildingPositivism and Constructivism, continued | **Assignment 2 due** **Discussion:**How theory is used in dissertation research**Each person pick one UTA SSW dissertation that has been done in the past 5 years (see ProQuest e-database) and read the theory sections in preparation for this discussion** **Required reading:***BlackBoard Class 7**Ritzer Chapter14*Readings continued from Class 6 |
| *Class 8*Change Process Research and Theories of Change: Comparative Theoretical PerspectivesStage Theories Psychodynamic theory and practice modelsTranstheoretical Model and Motivational InterviewingMacro Change Process practice theories | **Required reading:***BlackBoard Class 8* Robbins Chapters 7-9 Lemert Parts 1-3-Freud, Fromm, Erikson*Jaccard Chapter 9* |
| *Class 9 online*Change Process Research and Theories of Change, continuedBehavioral, Cognitive, Social Learning Social Exchange TheoryBehavioral, Cognitive-Behavioral, and Social Learning social work practice theories and models  | **Required reading:**For Class 10, read a selected program (see below) on [**http://nrepp.samhsa.gov/**](http://nrepp.samhsa.gov/) *BlackBoard Class 9* Robbins Chapter 12 Lemert Part 4- Galbraith, Skocpol *Ritzer Chapter 8* |
| *Class 10*Intervention ResearchTranspersonal TheorySpirituality Ecomap model | **Discussion:** **Each person pick one evidence-based program/practice from the SAMHSA National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (**[**http://nrepp.samhsa.gov/**](http://nrepp.samhsa.gov/)**). From the “Find an Intervention” link, select one program/practice for review in class.** Why did you choose this particular program? How clear is the theory or logic model underpinning the intervention? You may need to review original sources for the intervention to discover the underlying model.**Required reading:**BlackBoard Class 10Robbins Chapter 13 |
| *Class 11online*Model-testing: QualitativePostmodernist TheoryNarrative therapy: A constructivist postmodern model | **Assignment 3 due** **Required reading:***BlackBoard Class 11*Lemert Parts 4-5-Derrida, Lyotard, Rorty, Giddens*Ritzer Chapters 11 and 13**Jaccard Chapter 10* |
| *Class 12*Model-testing: QuantitativeGlobalization Theory | **Assignment 3 oral presentations in class** **Discussion:** Group review of theories and associated models in preparation for Assignment 4**Required reading:***BlackBoard Class 12**Ritzer Chapter12**Jaccard Chapter 11* |
| *Class 13***Posting in Blackboard of the empirical article for Assignment 4 at the end of class**Task Analysis and Other Frameworks for Analysis of ModelsAn empirical model of therapeutic process based on task analysisGlobalization Theory, continued |  **Assignment 3 oral presentations in class****Discussion:** Group review of theories and associated models in preparation for Assignment 4**Required reading:**BlackBoard Class 13Select and read an award winning empirical article which disseminates theory-driven research for class 14 |
| *Class 14online*Dissemination of Theoretical Models | **Assignment 4 due**  **Discussion Online:** **Each person pick one award winning empirical article from the *Research on Social Work Practice* Dissertationor otherResearch Award site (**[**http://www.sswr.org/awards**](http://www.sswr.org/awards)**), or the *Journal on Social Work Education* annual empirical article award (e.g.,** [**http://www.cswe.org/cms/43292.aspx**](http://www.cswe.org/cms/43292.aspx)**), or a dissertation from the *National Symposium on Doctoral Research in Social Work*. Columbus: Ohio State University** (https://kb.osu.edu/dspace/handle/1811/25137)**to discuss on the BlackBoard Discussion Board section as an example of dissemination of theoretical models.**How clear is the theory or logic model underpinning the research?What is your analysis of the exemplary strengths of this article as a vehicle to disseminate new knowledge of theoretical models?**Required reading:**BlackBoard Class 14*Jaccard Chapters 12 and 13* |
| *Class 15*HBSE content posttest with clickers | **Assignment 4 oral presentations in class**  |

**Attendance Policy:** Students are expected to attend class or inform the instructor if an absence is necessary.

**Drop Policy:** Students may drop or swap (adding and dropping a class concurrently) classes through self-service in MyMav from the beginning of the registration period through the late registration period. After the late registration period, students must see their academic advisor to drop a class or withdraw. Undeclared students must see an advisor in the University Advising Center. Drops can continue through a point two-thirds of the way through the term or session. It is the student's responsibility to officially withdraw if they do not plan to attend after registering. **Students will not be automatically dropped for non-attendance**. Repayment of certain types of financial aid administered through the University may be required as the result of dropping classes or withdrawing. For more information, contact the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships (<http://wweb.uta.edu/aao/fao/>).

**Americans with Disabilities Act:** The University of Texas at Arlington is on record as being committed to both the spirit and letter of all federal equal opportunity legislation, including the *Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)*. All instructors at UT Arlington are required by law to provide "reasonable accommodations" to students with disabilities, so as not to discriminate on the basis of that disability. Any student requiring an accommodation for this course must provide the instructor with official documentation in the form of a letter certified by the staff in the Office for Students with Disabilities, University Hall 102. Only those students who have officially documented a need for an accommodation will have their request honored. Information regarding diagnostic criteria and policies for obtaining disability-based academic accommodations can be found at [www.uta.edu/disability](http://www.uta.edu/disability) or by calling the Office for Students with Disabilities at (817) 272-3364.

**Academic Integrity:** Students enrolled in this course are expected to adhere to the UT Arlington Honor Code:

*I pledge, on my honor, to uphold UT Arlington’s tradition of academic integrity, a tradition that values hard work and honest effort in the pursuit of academic excellence.*

*I promise that I will submit only work that I personally create or contribute to group collaborations, and I will appropriately reference any work from other sources. I will follow the highest standards of integrity and uphold the spirit of the Honor Code.*

UT Arlington faculty members may employ the Honor Code as they see fit in their courses, including (but not limited to) having students acknowledge the honor code as part of an examination or requiring students to incorporate the honor code into any work submitted. Per UT System *Regents’ Rule* 50101, §2.2, suspected violations of university’s standards for academic integrity (including the Honor Code) will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct. Violators will be disciplined in accordance with University policy, which may result in the student’s suspension or expulsion from the University.

**Student Support Services**:UT Arlington provides a variety of resources and programs designed to help students develop academic skills, deal with personal situations, and better understand concepts and information related to their courses. Resources include tutoring, major-based learning centers, developmental education, advising and mentoring, personal counseling, and federally funded programs. For individualized referrals, students may visit the reception desk at University College (Ransom Hall), call the Maverick Resource Hotline at 817-272-6107, send a message to resources@uta.edu, or view the information at [www.uta.edu/resources](http://www.uta.edu/resources).

**Librarian to Contact:**  John Dillard, 817-272-7518, Building A-111.

Library Home Page <http://www.uta.edu/library>

Subject Guides <http://libguides.uta.edu>

Subject Librarians <http://www.uta.edu/library/help/subject-librarians.php>

Database List <http://www.uta.edu/library/databases/index.php>

Course Reserves <http://pulse.uta.edu/vwebv/enterCourseReserve.do>

Library Catalog <http://discover.uta.edu/>

E-Journals <http://liblink.uta.edu/UTAlink/az>

Library Tutorials <http://www.uta.edu/library/help/tutorials.php>

Connecting from Off- Campus <http://libguides.uta.edu/offcampus>

Ask A Librarian [http://ask.uta.edu](http://ask.uta.edu/)

**Electronic Communication:** UT Arlington has adopted MavMail as its official means to communicate with students about important deadlines and events, as well as to transact university-related business regarding financial aid, tuition, grades, graduation, etc. All students are assigned a MavMail account and are responsible for checking the inbox regularly. There is no additional charge to students for using this account, which remains active even after graduation. Information about activating and using MavMail is available at <http://www.uta.edu/oit/cs/email/mavmail.php>.

**Student Feedback Survey:** At the end of each term, students enrolled in classes categorized as “lecture,” “seminar,” or “laboratory” shall be directed to complete an online Student Feedback Survey (SFS). Instructions on how to access the SFS for this course will be sent directly to each student through MavMail approximately 10 days before the end of the term. Each student’s feedback enters the SFS database anonymously and is aggregated with that of other students enrolled in the course. UT Arlington’s effort to solicit, gather, tabulate, and publish student feedback is required by state law; students are strongly urged to participate. For more information, visit <http://www.uta.edu/sfs>.

**Final Review Week:** A period of five class days prior to the first day of final examinations in the long sessions shall be designated as Final Review Week. The purpose of this week is to allow students sufficient time to prepare for final examinations. During this week, there shall be no scheduled activities such as required field trips or performances; and no instructor shall assign any themes, research problems or exercises of similar scope that have a completion date during or following this week *unless specified in the class syllabus*. During Final Review Week, an instructor shall not give any examinations constituting 10% or more of the final grade, except makeup tests and laboratory examinations. In addition, no instructor shall give any portion of the final examination during Final Review Week. During this week, classes are held as scheduled. In addition, instructors are not required to limit content to topics that have been previously covered; they may introduce new concepts as appropriate.

**Emergency Exit Procedures:** Should we experience an emergency event that requires us to vacate the building, students should exit the room and move toward the nearest exit, which is the stairwell located to the right of the classroom. When exiting the building during an emergency, one should never take an elevator but should use the stairwells. Faculty members and instructional staff will assist students in selecting the safest route for evacuation and will make arrangements to assist handicapped individuals.

**Grade Grievance Policy**: Any appeal of a grade in this course must follow the procedures and deadlines for grade-related grievances as published in the current graduate catalog. For graduate courses, see http://grad.pci.uta.edu/about/catalog/current/general/regulations/#gradegrievances.
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