

GOV 85.39: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy (subject to change)

Professor Kathleen Powers

Email: kathleen.e.powers@dartmouth.edu

Office: 223 Silsby Hall and Grantham, NH

Office Hours: Tuesdays 8:30-9:30am EST, Thursday 5:00pm-6:00pm EST.

- Please book an appointment at least 30 minutes in advance using calendly.
- Please do not book appointments more than 1 week in advance.
- I will hold office hours via Zoom (meeting link; passcode: powershour). If you cannot meet via Zoom, please make a note when you book via calendly and we can arrange an alternative.

Class Meetings/Course format: K block (Tuesday/Thursdays 2:50-4:40pm EST)

- This course is a discussion-centered seminar. We will meet live via Zoom ([meeting link](#); passcode: holsti) during the scheduled period.
- Our seminar discussions will not be recorded. You must attend to participate in the class.

Course Description

This course investigates public opinion about U.S. foreign policy. We examine prominent scholarly debates about whether foreign policy public opinion is rational, coherent, and a factor in policy outcomes. The course will be structured around several important questions, including: Does the American public have organized views about foreign policy? How do ideology, partisanship, values, and facts shape foreign policy attitudes? To what extent do leaders and the media shape foreign policy public opinion? Does the public affect foreign policy decision-making, either directly or by influencing voting behavior?

Learning objectives

Upon completing the course, students should be able to:

- Explain what we mean by “public opinion,” and where it comes from.
- Explain the key propositions of the “Almond-Lippmann” consensus about foreign policy public opinion.
- Evaluate and analyze the extent to which Americans have organized views about foreign policy.
- Evaluate research on the sources of foreign policy public opinion – including psychological and political factors (e.g., values, ideology), leaders, and the media.
- Analyze the extent to which public opinion about foreign policy affects elections and/or foreign policy decision-making.

- Critique scholarly work on public opinion in terms of argument, methods, and evidence, both verbally and in writing.

Course format

This course will be conducted as a discussion-based seminar. I will offer introductory remarks (brief lectures if necessary) to a) introduce context for theories central to course meeting and/or b) highlight and expand on key points from the readings, but these are supplementary. Students should come to class prepared to participate and lead discussions having already completed the assigned readings.

Course Requirements

There are 4 graded components to this course. These include: (1) Participation/Engagement (25%), (2) 2 response papers (10%), (3) Class presentations (10%), and (4) a final term paper (55%). **We will discuss as a class what constitutes a passing grade, and I will update the syllabus.**

Reading: This course does not require you to purchase any books. All readings are posted to the class Canvas site. You should prepare to closely, critically, read 3-4 full academic articles or chapters each week. You should arrive each day prepared with comments, critiques, questions from your close reading.

Reading academic work is not passive – you should be engaging the material and developing questions and critiques as you read and prepare for class. What does critical, active reading look like? As you read, consider e.g.: What are the argument's strengths and weaknesses? And what are the implications of those weaknesses for the author's theory or conclusions? What did you find puzzling or debatable about the argument or evidence? Did you agree with the author's conclusions? Why or why not? How might other scholars we have read disagree with the article's theory or conclusions? What kind of evidence would contradict the argument? What are the practical, political implications of the argument?

Participation/Engagement (25%): A discussion class only works if everyone participates constructively. Therefore, 25% of the final grade will be based on participation and engagement, divided into two categories.

- Students should **attend class prepared** to engage in deep and constructive discussion about the readings. You should have read the material in advance of our meeting. While you must be present to participate, merely attending class does not constitute participation. Instead, you should expect to contribute to each discussion.
- To help facilitate discussion, you will submit one discussion question for each article that *does not* have a formal discussant presenter. I will flag these articles each week, and you **should submit your discussion question by 12:00pmEST** on the day that we will discuss that reading. Your discussion questions should aim

to stimulate discussion – questions about an argument’s logic, assumptions, empirical evidence, differences between the argument and other things we have read, or policy implications, for example, constitute good starting points. Questions should be fewer than 100 words and end in a question mark.

- **A note on engagement and Zooming:** Together, we are facing unusual circumstances, even as we enter the 4th term of virtual Dartmouth. Participation/engagement via our live class meetings may be more challenging for some students than others – due to the interface, internet connectivity, or a host of other things. If you face specific challenges, please reach out to me as soon as possible so that we can find a solution that works for your situation.

Short response papers (10%): You will select two weeks during the term to submit a **short response** regarding the week’s reading material and class discussion. These essays do not require external research, but they should make a specific argument. You can expand on ideas you voiced during our meetings with a more structured argument, highlight advantages or shortcomings from a specific reading and suggest improvements, discuss how the week’s material complements or contradicts material from other weeks, or develop an argument that you might pursue for your final research paper. Each paper should be 1-2 double-spaced pages (2-page limit).

- Response papers are due at 11:59pm EST on the Saturday that ends the week. For example, if you write a response paper about foreign policy attitude structure in Week 3 (class meetings Jan 19, 21), your response paper is due January 23 at 11:59pm EST.

Class Presentations (10%): Throughout the term, you will give class presentations. For your **article presentation** (7-10 minutes maximum), you will present the assigned article as if it were your own. When you are a **discussant** (3-5 minutes maximum), you will critique the article, noting key flaws or limitations and closing with 3 questions designed to motivate group discussion.

- **Both presentations** are designed to a) build presentation and speaking skills (even though they will not be delivered “live”), b) build skills in discussion leadership because presenters & discussants will play prominent roles in class discussions, and c) encourage additional critical engagement with scholarship. **Both** presentations should incorporate slides with key points.
- For your **article presentation**, you will act as an advocate for the piece. Explain the paper’s contributions, with a focus on a) the question that motivates the paper, b) necessary background (how have other people answered this question), c) the main argument, d) the evidence to support that argument, and e) why the argument and/or evidence are important (e.g., what are the implications). [Here](#) is an example of an excellent article presentation (shared with explicit permission).
- For your **discussant presentation**, you will offer a targeted critique, pointing out what you see as the article’s main strengths and weaknesses. What do you find *most* convincing (and why), what do you find *least* convincing (and why it matters), and what questions does the paper leave open? When you craft questions to guide discussion, aim

to keep each under 80 words. Be concise! [Here](#) is an example of an excellent discussant presentation (also shared with permission; one caveat: This example is 1 minute too long. Don't go over time!)

[Sign up for presentations using this google sheet.](#)

Final Paper Projects (2.5% + 2.5% + 50%): You will complete a final research paper about a topic of your choosing, related to public opinion and foreign policy (of course). The paper should combine course material with external research, and is due on March 16 (near the end of finals period). There will be three projects associated with your final paper:

- 1) A 1-2 page proposal and annotated bibliography with at least 5 sources, due January 29 at 11:59pm EST. **(2.5%)**
- 2) A draft paper (at least $\frac{3}{4}$ complete), due March 5 at 11:59pm *and* 1 peer review due March 9 at 11:59pm EST. **(2.5%)**
- 3) A final research paper (15-20 pages), due March 16 at 11:59pm EST. **(50%)**

Grades: I define grades using Dartmouth's official description. A range grades denote "excellence" (per Prof. Wohlforth, "by definition not an average or common quality), Bs denote "good" work, Cs "acceptable", Ds "deficient" and E "seriously deficient" work. **In the Government department**, median grades for seminars may not exceed A-.

Resources: So you want to know what the public thinks (or thought) about foreign policy (or anything else)? Check out any of the following:

- [Gallup](#)
- [Polling Report](#)
- [World Public Opinion](#) (especially [Americans and the world](#))
- [Chicago Council on World Affairs](#)
- [Pew Global Attitudes](#)
- [Roper iPoll](#)
- [Transatlantic Trends](#)

Any of these resources could provide a useful launching point for your final research paper.

Other stuff:

Prior knowledge: This seminar should be accessible to students with some background in the government department, including courses on international politics and political behavior. Most of the reading assignments will contain statistical analyses, and so some proficiency in reading quantitative research will be helpful to your success.

Course Policies: Late papers will be penalized for each day past the deadline. Please speak with me if you anticipate or encounter circumstances that might affect your ability to get your work in on time.

Attendance: Attendance is required, because our seminar will be most engaging with contributions from the full class. Of course, stuff happens – please notify me in advance. We will determine as a class how to account for attendance and earning credit for the course.

Recording: Our discussion sessions will not be recorded, to make it easier for everyone to speak and share freely. Do not attempt to record your peers without their explicit consent (required by law in New Hampshire). Please notify me if you have accessibility-related concerns.

LEGAL STUFF ABOUT RECORDING:

By enrolling in this course, you agree to the following:

(1) Consent to recording of course and group office hours

a) I affirm my understanding that this course and any associated group meetings involving students and the instructor, including but not limited to scheduled and ad hoc office hours and other consultations, may be recorded within any digital platform used to offer remote instruction for this course;

b) I further affirm that the instructor owns the copyright to their instructional materials, of which these recordings constitute a part, and distribution of any of these recordings in whole or in part without prior written consent of the instructor may be subject to discipline by Dartmouth up to and including expulsion;

b) I authorize Dartmouth and anyone acting on behalf of Dartmouth to record my participation and appearance in any medium, and to use my name, likeness, and voice in connection with such recording; and

c) I authorize Dartmouth and anyone acting on behalf of Dartmouth to use, reproduce, or distribute such recording without restrictions or limitation for any educational purpose deemed appropriate by Dartmouth and anyone acting on behalf of Dartmouth.

(2) Recording policy

By enrolling in this course, I hereby affirm that I will not under any circumstance make a recording in any medium of any one-on-one or group meeting with the instructor and/or students without obtaining the prior written consent of all those participating, and I understand that if I violate this prohibition, I will be subject to discipline by Dartmouth up to and including expulsion, as well as any other civil or criminal penalties under applicable law.

Emails: Please make use of Piazza, and office hours as much as possible. Of course, you are welcome to email me, but 48 hour delays in responding are not unusual.

Course Outline and Reading Schedule*

*Subject to changes based on global health crises and, with notice, professor's discretion.

Note: You should read the articles in the order that they appear on the syllabus; we will discuss them in that order (first two on Tuesday, remaining/overall on Thursday), unless otherwise indicated.

Note 2: Readings marked “**Background**” are required but will not be a focal point for our discussions. They will provide useful context for the other readings. Readings marked “**optional**” are truly optional – they are there for you to read if you are interested, to look at for your research paper, or to skim for additional context. All other listed readings are required.

A useful overview (and resource for paper writing), not required: Holsti, O. R. (2004). *Public opinion and American foreign policy*. University of Michigan Press.

Part I: Introductions and the Almond-Lippmann Consensus

“But I sometimes wonder whether in this respect a democracy is not uncomfortably similar to one of those prehistoric monsters with a body as long as this room and a brain the size of a pin: he lies there in his comfortable primeval mud and pays little attention to his environment; he is slow to wrath—in fact, you practically have to whack his tail off to make him aware that his interests are being disturbed; but, once he grasps this, he lays about him with such blind determination that he not only destroys his adversary but largely wrecks his native habitat.”

George Kennan 1951, p. 9

Week 1 (January 7)

Th: Introductions & the Almond-Lippmann consensus

- Seminars in a time of corona
- **Reading**
 - Dropp, Kyle, Kertzer, Joshua D. and Zeitzoff, Thomas (2014). “The Less Americans know about Ukraine’s location, the more they want the U.S. to intervene,” *The Washington Post*, 7 April.
 - Almond, G. (1960). *The American People and Foreign Policy*, New York: Harcourt Brace. **Read chapter 4 and pages 87-88 and 106-115 in chapter 5.**
 - Lippmann, W. (1955). *Essays in the Public Philosophy*, Boston: Little Brown. Chapter 2: The Malady of Democratic States.
 - **Optional:** Converse, PE, (1964). “The Nature and Origins of Belief Systems in Mass Publics,” in *Ideology and Discontent*, David Apter ed., New York: The Free Press. Pp. 206-261. **Read only pp. 206-219, 255-256.**

- **Optional:** Saunders, Elizabeth N. (2016) “Will foreign policy be a major issue in the 2016 election? Here’s what we know,” *The Washington Post’s The Monkey Cage*, 26 January.
- **Optional:** Kriner, D. L., & Shen, F. X. (2020). Battlefield Casualties and Ballot-Box Defeat: Did the Bush–Obama Wars Cost Clinton the White House?. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 53(2), 248-252.
- Discussion: Taking stock of our priors
 - What (or who) drives public opinion about foreign policy?
 - Is the public rational?
 - What policies does the public prefer? Do they undermine strategic goals, or are they “a force for enlightenment”?
 - Does the public have any effect on foreign policy?

Part II: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus

“Perhaps the graves general problem confronting policymakers is that of the instability of mass moods, the cyclical fluctuations which stand in the way of policy stability”
Almond, 1950 p. 239

“A president who cannot entrust the people with the truth betrays a certain lack of faith in the basic tenets of democracy. But because the masses are notoriously shortsighted, and generally cannot see danger until it is at their throats, our statesmen are forced to deceive them into an awareness of their own long-run interests.”
Bailey 1948 p. 13

Week 2 (Jan 12, 14): Public Opinion is Volatile?

T, Th: A rational public?

- **Reading:**
 - **Background:** Page, Benjamin I. and Robert Shapiro (1988). “Foreign Policy and the Rational Public,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 32(2): 211-247. **Read pp. 211-top of 226; skim 226-243; read the conclusion.**
 - Kertzer, Joshua D. (2013). “Making Sense of Isolationism: Foreign Policy mood as a Multilevel Phenomenon,” *Journal of Politics*, 75(1), 225-240.
 - Flores-Macías, G. A., & Kreps, S. E. (2017). “Borrowing support for war: The effect of war finance on public attitudes toward conflict.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 61(5), 997-1020.
 - Gelpi, C., Feaver, P. D., & Reifler, J. (2006). Success matters: Casualty sensitivity and the war in Iraq. *International Security*, 30(3), 7-46.
 - Fazal, Tanisha M. "Life and Limb: New Estimates of Casualty Aversion in the United States." *International Studies Quarterly* (2020).
 - **Optional:** Jentleson, B. W. (1992). The pretty prudent public: Post post-Vietnam American opinion on the use of military force. *International Studies Quarterly*, 36(1), 49-74.

Week 3 (Jan 19, 21): Public opinion is incoherent?

T, Th: Foreign policy attitude structure.

- **Reading:**

- **Background:** Hurwitz, Jon and Mark Peffley. 1987. "How are Foreign Policy Attitudes Structured? A Hierarchical Model," *American Political Science Review*, 81(4), 1099-1120. **Read pp. 1099-1106; skim through 1113, read the conclusion**
- Martini, N. F. (2015). Foreign policy ideology and conflict preferences: A look at Afghanistan and Libya. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 11(4), 417-434.
- Maxey, Sarah. "The power of humanitarian narratives: a domestic coalition theory of justifications for military action." *Political Research Quarterly* 73, no. 3 (2020): 680-695.
- Gries, Peter, (2014). *The Politics of American Foreign Policy: How Ideology Divides Liberals and Conservatives over Foreign Affairs*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. **Chapter 10: "International Organizations and Treaties: Blue Helmets, Black Helicopters, and Satanic Serpents."** **SKIM chapters 2-3 as needed for conceptual definitions**
- **Optional:** Gravelle, Timothy B., Jason Reifler, and Thomas J. Scotto. "The Structure of Foreign Policy Attitudes in Transatlantic Perspective: Comparing the United States, United Kingdom, France and Germany" *European Journal of Political Research* 56.4 (2017): 757-776.

Week 4 (Jan 26, 28): Public opinion is incoherent? II

T, Th: Values and foreign policy preferences

- **Reading:**

- Rathbun, Brian C., Joshua D. Kertzer, Jason Reifler, Paul Goren, and Thomas J. Scotto. "Taking Foreign Policy Personally: Personal Values and Foreign Policy Attitudes." *International Studies Quarterly* 60.1 (2016): 124-137.
- Kreps, S., & Maxey, S. (2018). Mechanisms of Morality: Sources of Support for Humanitarian Intervention. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 62(8), 1814-1842.
- Lizotte, Mary-Kate. "The gender gap in support for humanitarian interventions." *Journal of Human Rights* (2020): 1-18.
- **Optional:** Brooks, Deborah Jordan and Benjamin A. Valentino. 2011. "A War of One's Own: Understanding the Gender Gap in Support for War," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 75(2), 270-286.
- **Optional:** Tomz, M. R., & Weeks, J. L. (2020). Human rights and public support for war. *The Journal of Politics*, 82(1), 182-194.
- **Optional:** Eichenberg, R. C. (2016). Gender difference in American public opinion on the use of military force, 1982-2013. *International Studies Quarterly*, 60(1), 138-148.

***** Paper proposal due Friday January 29 at 11:59pm EST*****

Week 5 (Feb 2, 4): Elites lead, the public follows?

T, Th: Elite cues

• **Reading:**

- **Background:** Berinsky, Adam J., 2007. "Assuming the Costs of War: Events, Elites, and American Public Support for Military Conflict." *Journal of Politics*, 69(4), 975-97. **Read pp. 975-979** (but the WII analysis on pp. 986-994 is also neat)
- Guisinger, Alexandra, and Elizabeth N. Saunders. 2017. "Mapping the Boundaries of Elite Cues: How Elites Shape Mass Opinion Across International Issues." *International Studies Quarterly*
- Kertzer, J. D., & Zeitzoff, T. (2017). A bottom-up theory of public opinion about foreign policy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 61(3), 543-558.
- Hayes, Danny, and Matt Guardino. "The Influence of Foreign Voices on U.S. Public Opinion." *American Journal of Political Science* 55.4 (2011): 830–850.
- **Optional:** Golby, J., Feaver, P., & Dropp, K. (2018). Elite military cues and public opinion about the use of military force. *Armed Forces & Society*, 44(1), 44-71.
- **Optional:** Maxey S. Limited Spin: When the Public Punishes Leaders Who Lie about Military Action. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. September 2020.
- **Optional:** Zvobgo, Kelebogile. "Human rights versus national interests: Shifting US public attitudes on the international criminal court." *International Studies Quarterly* 63, no. 4 (2019): 1065-1078.

Week 6 (Feb 9, 11): What role does the media play?

T, Th: Media & the public

• **Reading:**

- Baum M and T Groeling. 2010. "Reality Asserts Itself: Public Opinion on Iraq and the Elasticity of Reality." *International Organization*, 64(3):443-479.
- Kull, Ramsay, and Lewis (2003-04). "Misperceptions, the Media, and the Iraq War," *Political Science Quarterly*, 118(4), 569-598.
- Gadarian, Shana Kushner. 2010. "The Politics of Threat: How Terrorism News Shapes Foreign Policy Attitudes," *Journal of Politics*, 72(2), 469-483.

Week 7 (Feb 16, 18): Public opinion and Foreign Economic Policy

T, Th: Economic Attitudes

• **Reading:**

- **Background:** Scheve, Kenneth, and Matthew Slaughter. "What Determines Individual Trade Policy Preferences?" *Journal of International Economics* 54 (2001): 267–292

- Mansfield, Edward D., and Diana C. Mutz. “Support for Free Trade: Self-Interest, Sociotropic Politics, and Out-Group Anxiety.” *International Organization* 63.3 (2009): 425–457.
- Rho, S., & Tomz, M. (2017). Why don't trade preferences reflect economic self-interest?. *International Organization*, 71(S1), S85-S108.
- Prather, L. (2020). Transnational Ties and Support for Foreign Aid. *International Studies Quarterly*, 64(1), 133-147.
- **Optional:** Heinrich, Tobias and Kobayashi, (2018). “How do people evaluate foreign aid to ‘nasty’ regimes?” *British Journal of Political Science*, 50, 103-127.

Part IV: Foreign Policy Public Opinion and Political Outcomes

“To hell with public opinion.... We should lead, not follow.”
State Department Official qtd in Cohen 1973, p. 62.

Week 8 (Feb 23, 25): Public opinion does not matter?

T, Th: Electoral politics

- **Reading:**

- **Background:** Aldrich, John H., John L. Sullivan, and Eugene Borgida. 1989. “Foreign Affairs and Issue Voting: Do Presidential Candidates ‘Waltz Before a Blind Audience’?” *American Political Science Review*, 83(1), 123-141. **Read pp. 123-131.**
- Karol, David and Edward Miguel. 2005. “The Electoral Costs of War: Iraq Casualties and the 2004 U.S. Presidential Election,” *Journal of Politics*, 69(3), 633-648.
- Gadarian, S. K. (2010). Foreign policy at the ballot box: How citizens use foreign policy to judge and choose candidates. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(4), 1046-1062.
- Guisinger, A. (2009). “Determining trade policy: Do voters hold politicians accountable?” *International Organization*, 63(3), 533-557.
- **Optional:** Croco, S. E., & Weeks, J. L. (2016). War outcomes and leader tenure. *World Politics*, 68(4), 577-607.
- **Optional:** Aldrich, J. H., Gelpi, C., Feaver, P., Reifler, J., & Sharp, K. T. (2006). Foreign policy and the electoral connection. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9, 477-502. (this is a handy overview, albeit a bit dated)

Week 9 (March 2, 4): Public opinion does not matter? II

T, Th: Constraining leaders

***** Draft Paper due Friday, March 5 at 11:59pm*****

- **Reading:**

- **Background:** Jacobs, L. R., & Page, B. I. (2005). “Who influences US foreign policy?” *American political science review*, 99(1), 107-123. **Read pp. 107-109 and 120-121.**

- Foyle D. 2004. Leading the Public To War? The Influence of American Public Opinion on the Bush Administration's Decision to go to War in Iraq. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 16:269-295.
- Tomz, Michael, Weeks, Jessica L.P., and Keren Yarhi-Milo, (2020). “Public Opinion and Decisions About Military Force in Democracies,” *International Organization*, 74, 119-143.
- Barnhart, Joslyn N., Robert F. Trager, Elizabeth N. Saunders, and Allan Dafoe. "The suffragist peace." *International Organization* 74, no. 4 (2020): 633-670.
- **Optional:** Baum, M. 2004. “How Public Opinion Constrains the Use of Force: The Case of Operation Restore Hope,” *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 34, 187-227.
- **Optional:** Stein, Rachel M. 2015. “War and Revenge: Explaining Conflict Initiation by Democracies,” *American Political Science Review*, 109(3).
- **Optional:** Kertzer, J. D., Busby, J., Monten, J., Tama, J., & Kafura, C. (2020). “Elite Misperceptions and the Domestic Politics of Conflict,” *working paper*.
- **Optional:** Kreps, S. (2010). “Elite consensus as a determinant of alliance cohesion: Why public opinion hardly matters for NATO-led operations in Afghanistan,” *Foreign policy analysis*, 6(3), 191-215.

Week 10 (March 9)

***** Peer review due Tuesday, March 9 at 11:59pm*****

M: Course Wrap-up

- **Reading:** No reading, but you will have a short assignment to complete in preparation for our meeting.

*****Final Paper due Tuesday, March 16 at 11:59pm*****

Other Course Information:

Communication and Email: I will provide updates about the course and changes to the syllabus using email and Piazza through Canvas. Before emailing a question, please first check the syllabus and Piazza page to ensure that has not already been addressed – this frees up time so that I can respond to substantive inquiries.

Academic Honor Principle: As a Dartmouth student, you have agreed to abide by the College’s [Academic Honor Principle](#). Students should be aware of [proper citation practices](#). Lack of knowledge about what constitutes plagiarism does not excuse a violation – take the time to learn about it, and if you are confused *at all*, please consult with me. I take violations very seriously, but am happy to talk with students about citation practices and offer resources at any time.

Student Accessibility Needs: Students with disabilities who may need disability-related academic adjustments and services for this course are encouraged to see me privately as early in the term as possible. Students requiring disability related academic adjustments and services must consult the [Student Accessibility Services](#) office (Carson Hall, Suite 125, 646-9900). Once SAS has authorized services, students must show the originally signed SAS Services and Consent Form and/or a letter on SAS letterhead to me. As a first step, if students have questions about whether they qualify to receive academic adjustments and services, they should contact the SAS office. All inquiries and discussions will remain confidential.

Religious Observances: Some students may wish to take part in religious observances that occur during this academic term. If you have a religious observance that conflicts with your participation in the course, please meet with me before the end of the second week of the term to discuss appropriate accommodations.

Remote Access to Campus Resources (via Professor Kimberly Rogers):

I recognize that the academic environment at Dartmouth is challenging, that our terms are intensive, and that classes are not the only demanding aspect of your life. Many of you may be facing greater challenges than usual given the sudden changes to your living and learning environment, public health concerns, and a host of other factors (e.g., housing or food insecurity, new or changing caregiving responsibilities, visa and accessibility concerns, access to health and mental health support, and so on).

There are a number of campus resources available this term to support your needs. While the situation is constantly evolving, many offices are prepared to meet with you via phone or Zoom. For concerns about health and wellness, you may reach out to the [Dartmouth Health Service](#) (603-646-9400 or Secure Message in DartHub), [Counseling Services](#) (603-646-9442), and the [Student Wellness Center](#). For academic needs, you may contact your [undergraduate dean](#) (603-646-2243), [Student Accessibility Services](#) (603-646-9900), and the [Academic Skills Center](#) (603-646-2014). Students with concerns related to campus employment may connect with the [Student Employment Office](#) (603-646-3641). Those with visa-related concerns may reach out to the [Office of Visa and Immigration Services](#) (603-646-3474). I encourage you to take advantage of these resources, and to speak with me if you need support in the class.

Please note that faculty and staff are required by law to report certain matters to relevant parties on campus, including disclosures of sexual or gender-based harassment, sexual assault, relationship and interpersonal violence, and stalking. You can find more information about confidential versus non-confidential resources and support options [here](#).