

Spring 2022 – Thursdays – 9:30am-12:20pm**Section:** 20851D**Location:** ASC328 / Zoom as needed (see Blackboard for Zoom links)**Instructor: Prof Mike Ananny****Office Hours (via Zoom):** Mondays 9-10am, 1-2pm & by appointment**Contact Info:** ananny@usc.edu

This course—its topics, readings, expectations—is designed for PhD students in any discipline. If you are not a PhD student, please contact me ASAP to discuss your preparedness for the course.

Course Description

This course introduces students to historical and contemporary debates about publics: how they are conceptualized, idealized, made, resisted, and deployed. It traces the idea of the public across philosophical traditions, political commitments, communication institutions, and digital infrastructures, focusing on the role that networked information technologies play in envisioning and building public life.

Primarily intended for PhD students in Communication, but open to PhD students in any field, students will closely read and critique foundational accounts of publicness (e.g., Dewey, Habermas, Young, Fraser, Benhabib, Taylor), use these theories and critiques thereof to build interdisciplinary concepts of “public,” examine newer work on networked publics in light of historical debates, and build theoretically informed critiques of contemporary sociotechnical systems that claims to serve public functions, or that are relevant to the idea of publicness.

The course is organized into 6 themes:

1. Foundations & Models
2. Norms & Ideals
3. Laws & Institutions
4. Sizes & Scales
5. Time & Temporality
6. Sociotechnical Contexts

The readings address weekly “thought questions” that guide students’ reflections as they examine different theories of the public and practice applying those theories to example systems of their choice.

Essentially, the course helps students answer three questions: what are networked publics, where have they come from, and why do they matter?

Student Learning Outcomes

By the end of the course, students should be able to talk about publics from different theoretical and normative perspectives, appreciate the tensions and tradeoffs among them, critique contemporary, networked publics, and connect ideals of publicness to designs and experiences of communication infrastructures, institutions, and sociotechnical systems.

Course Expectations/Policies

Students are expected to be present and focused in each meeting; a course like this works best when students engage with the readings and each other thoughtfully, professionally, and attentively. See this as a space to practice developing your ideas and those of your fellow students. Please use laptops for note taking only, silence phones before each meeting begins, and refrain from having back-channel or side conversations. Your participation is crucial. In a small seminar it’s completely obvious when someone has checked out and is no longer present; please don’t do that.

Please speak up, take risks, and experiment with taking new perspectives you wouldn’t normally adopt. And please be generous, gentle, and generative with yourself and everyone in the seminar. The best learning involves being vulnerable and learning to take care of others’ vulnerabilities.

It is also critically important that you do each week's readings and that you meet the deadlines for the weekly memos. This is non-negotiable and I will ask people to leave the class if they're not prepared. In a course like this you can't afford to fall behind on the readings.

I also understand that students are often under a great deal of stress, and that such stress can take different forms and appear at different times in the semester. Please don't disappear, and don't think that you're alone in experiencing stress or anxiety. To the extent that you feel comfortable, let me know how I can help. There are often simple ways of accommodating and adjusting that can help everyone have a successful semester.

Required Readings and Supplementary Materials

All materials are available through Blackboard. Except where noted, there are no texts to purchase.

Description and Assessment of Assignments

Weekly Memos with Question (20%): Post to Blackboard every week by 7pm Wednesday

Each week, you will write a short, approximately 350-500 word memo that engages with at least two of the week's readings. You have considerable freedom to pose questions you had as you read; contrast readings; connect themes you saw emerging among texts; critique authors' arguments; situate texts in relation to networked technologies. The goal is to reflect upon the readings and share reflections with your classmates so you arrive to class ready to participate. Memos will be graded as:

'check-plus' = thoughtful and sophisticated analysis that moves a conversation forward

'check' = a good effort that contributes to class, but could have been stronger

'minus' = not quite up to expectations, let's talk in person about how to improve

Please distribute each week's memo to the *entire class*, through Blackboard, by **7pm of the Wednesday night before the Thursday class**. This gives me time to read your memos, identify any common themes, and tailor class discussion if needed. You are encouraged but not required to read your classmates' memos.

Reading Openings (20%): Due at several points in the semester through class sign-up

At several points during the semester (exact number to be determined by the class size), you will individually 'open' a reading. I'll say more in class about what this means, but the ideal opening: stays close to the text (no divergences until we have a shared, grounded understanding of the author's argument); situates the text in relation to other readings and the course themes; and moves conversation forward, generating new research questions that critique and extend the text. You can make a hand-out or slides if you like, but neither is required. *Even if you are not opening a reading, you are expected to have read it and come to class prepared to discuss.*

System Openings (15%): Due at several points in the semester through class sign-up

Approximately (3x) during the semester (exact number to be determined by the class size), you will lead a discussion on a sociotechnical system that you think is relevant to the course's public sphere themes. These may be systems that you discussed in your weekly memo or systems that you would like to think through as a group in the context of the week's readings. Please be ready to discuss, for example: why you think it is an instance of a public sphere, who participates in it, what norms are embedded in its design, where its content comes from, how it is regulated (broadly construed), how you might study it, what research questions you would like to ask through it, what its history is, who is responsible for maintaining it, how it relates to this week's readings. (If you learned about the system from a news or trade press article, please feel free to email those articles beforehand through Blackboard.)

Project proposal (5%) :: Due Thursday, April 7

In preparation for your final project (see below), you will submit a proposal that describes what you're going to do, what theories or questions you'll be working with, what literature you're using or analyzing, what research methods you'll be using, what your timeline is, and any resources you require. This is meant to be a check-in so that you and I can understand what your final project will be and what you need to make it successful. In addition to this written proposal, I'm happy to meet with you 1-1 to discuss your plans.

Peer Feedback on Proposal (5%) :: Due Thursday, April 14

I ask you to review two of your peer's project proposal, submitting to me and your peers a short (few paragraphs) reflection on the strengths and opportunities for improvement in your peer's work. Additionally, you'll submit a single short reflection to me on the

feedback that you heard from both of your peer reviewers (a couple of paragraphs on what you heard and how you'll address it going forward).

Final project (40%) :: Presentation in class Thursday, April 28; paper due Thursday, May 12 [no extensions]

You have considerable freedom to decide the topic of your final project, but I ask you to choose one of the following formats:

1. a traditional “deep analysis” paper (5,000-6,000 words) in which you identify, analyze, and synthesize among a body of literature on some aspect of public spheres (this may take the form of a survey / comparative book review paper that you submit for publication);
2. a system/event/case evaluation paper (5,000-6,000 words) that is essentially a more in-depth public sphere case study (it must be a different example) in which you engage more deeply with theory and analyze gaps in theoretical literature and/or system design;
3. a system design in which you prototype a new example public sphere (we can discuss different design approaches and prototyping materials) *and* write a description (3,000 words) of how your prototype connects to the theoretical literature and course concepts. For this system design option, you are encouraged to work in a group to *prototype* the system, but each group member must submit his/her own description paper.

For all formats and papers, you are encouraged to use the readings we’ve discussed in class, consult the “recommended/supplemental” reading list at the end of the syllabus, and find sources of your own. I will say more about this project in class.

In the final class, you will give a 10-15 minute presentation on the state of your final project, getting feedback from the class that should feed into your final paper submission (due during the exam period).

Breakdown of Grade

Assignment	Due	Points	% of Grade
Weekly Memos	Weekly Blackboard posts by 7pm Wednesday	20	20%
Reading Openings	Various dates, to be scheduled in-class	20	20%
System Openings	Various dates, to be scheduled in-class	15	15%
Project Proposal	Thursday, April 7, 11:59pm (send PDF via email)	10	10%
Peer Feedback on Proposal	Thursday, April 14, 11:59pm (send PDF via email)	5	5%
Final Project	Thursday, May 12, 11:59pm (send PDF via email)	30	30%
TOTAL		100	100%

Grading Scale

94 to 100%: A	80% to 83%: B-	67% to 69%: D+
90% to 93%: A-	77% to 79%: C+	64% to 66%: D
87% to 89%: B+	74% to 76%: C	60% to 63%: D-
84% to 86%: B	70% to 73%: C-	0% to 59%: F

Grading Standards

Letter Grade	Description
A	Excellent; demonstrates extraordinarily high achievement; comprehensive knowledge and understanding of subject matter; all expectations met and exceeded.

B	Good; moderately broad knowledge and understanding of subject matter; explicitly or implicitly demonstrates good, if not thorough understanding; only minor substantive shortcomings.
C	Satisfactory/Fair; reasonable knowledge and understanding of subject matter; most expectations are met; despite any shortcomings, demonstrates basic level of understanding.
D	Marginal; minimal knowledge and understanding of subject matter; more than one significant shortcoming; deficiencies indicate only the most rudimentary level of understanding.
F	Failing; unacceptably low level of knowledge and understanding of subject matter; deficiencies indicate lack of understanding.

Grading Timeline

All submitted materials will be evaluated approximately one week from submissions.

Assignment Submission Policy

Final project proposal & Final Papers [email to me as PDFs]:

Please submit *all* papers on time. Failure to submit a paper by the specified deadline—without talking to me first—will automatically trigger a late penalty of one partial letter grade every 24 hours. E.g., if a paper would have earned an A but is submitted 24 hours late, its maximum possible grade is A-minus.

Memos [submit via Blackboard]:

No memos will be accepted after the weekly 7pm Wednesday deadline. Everyone gets **one “free” week when a memo is not required to be submitted**. You pick the week you want to skip submitting a memo with no penalty.

System & Reading Openings:

Since they are integral to particular class meetings, these cannot be made up. If, without talking to me first, you miss one of these commitments, I may either assign a zero for that missed opening, or ask you to prepare a make-up assignment. If you're ill, have an emergency, please let me know and we'll figure something out that does not penalize you.

Course Schedule: A Weekly Breakdown

Important note to students: *Be advised that this syllabus is subject to change - and probably will change - based on the progress of the class, events, and/or guest speaker availability. Students should consult the University [Registration Calendar](#) for dates associated with add/drop deadlines, fees, and grading options.*

WK	DATE	TOPIC	READINGS
1	13-Jan	Introduction	<p>Introductions, review the syllabus, course themes and expectations. Discuss contemporary examples of networked public spheres and how they relate to course themes, read some short texts together, share early final project ideas.</p> <p>QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER: What are your definitions of “public” and “public sphere”? What publics and public spheres do you participate in? What do you expect of public spheres, how do you know when one is ‘working’? What do you think the norms and values of a public sphere should be, why, and how do you see these instantiated in networked infrastructure design?</p>
2	20-Jan	Foundations & Models: Publics as Social Constructs & Contestations	<p>Calhoun, C. (2012). The Public Sphere in the Field of Power. In <i>The roots of radicalism: Tradition, the public sphere, and early nineteenth-century social movements</i> (pp. 121-151). Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.</p> <p>Dewey, J. (1954). Search for the public. <i>The public and its problems</i> (pp. 3-36). New York: Swallow Press.</p> <p>Marres, N. (2005). Issues spark a public into being: A key but often forgotten point of the Lippmann-Dewey debate. In B. Latour & P. Weibel (Eds.), <i>Making things public: Atmospheres of democracy</i> (pp. 208-217). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.</p> <p>Sandel, M. (1984). The procedural republic and the unencumbered self. <i>Political Theory</i>, 12, 81-96.</p> <p>Splichal, S. (2021). The public sphere in the twilight zone of publicness. <i>European Journal of Communication</i>, doi:10.1177/02673231211061490</p>
3	27-Jan	Foundations & Models: Habermas & Critics	<p>Benson, R. (2009). Shaping the public sphere: Habermas and beyond. <i>American Sociologist</i>, 40, 175-197.</p> <p>Calhoun, C. (1992). Introduction: Habermas and the public sphere. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), <i>Habermas and the Public Sphere</i> (pp. 1-48). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.</p> <p>Fraser, Nancy. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. <i>Social Text</i>, 25/26, 56-80.</p> <p>Landes, Joan B. (1995). The Public and the Private Sphere: A Feminist Reconsideration. In Johanna Meehan (Ed.), <i>Feminists read Habermas: Gendering the subject of discourse</i> (pp. 91-116). London, UK: Routledge.</p> <p>Warner, Michael. (2002). Publics and counterpublics. <i>Public Culture</i>, 14(1), 49-90.</p>

4	3-Feb	Norms & Ideals: Problematizing Participation	<p>Christians, C.G., Glasser, T.L., McQuail, D., Nordenstreng, K., & White, R.A. (2009). The principles and practice of democracy. Normative theories of the media (pp. 91-113). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.</p> <p>Dobson, A. (2012). Listening: The new democratic deficit. <i>Political Studies</i>, 60(4), 843-859.</p> <p>Kelty, Christopher M. (2017). Too much democracy in all the wrong places: Toward a grammar of participation. <i>Current Anthropology</i>, 58(S15). doi:doi:10.1086/688705</p> <p>Schudson, M. (2000). Good citizens and bad history: Today's political ideals in historical perspective. <i>The Communication Review</i>, 4(1), 1-19. doi:10.1080/10714420009359458</p> <p>Squires, C. R. (2002). Rethinking the Black Public Sphere: An Alternative Vocabulary for Multiple Public Spheres. <i>Communication Theory</i>, 12(4), 446-468. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2002.tb00278.x</p>
5	10-Feb	Norms & Ideals: Difference, Alterity, Universality	<p>Dawson, Michael C. (2012). The Black Public Sphere and Black Civil Society. In Lawrence D. Bobo, Lisa Crooms-Robinson, Linda Darling-Hammond, Michael C. Dawson, Henry Louis Gates, Gerald Jaynes, & Claude Steele (Eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of African American Citizenship, 1865-Present</i> (pp. 374-399). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Gould, Carol C. (1996). Diversity and democracy: Representing differences. In Seyla Benhabib (Ed.), <i>Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political</i> (pp. 171-186). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.</p> <p>Lichterman, Paul. (1999). Talking identity in the public sphere: Broad visions and small spaces in sexual identity politics. <i>Theory and Society</i>, 28, 101-141.</p> <p>Richardson, Allissa V. (2019). Dismantling Respectability: The Rise of New Womanist Communication Models in the Era of Black Lives Matter. <i>Journal of Communication</i>, 69(2), 193-213. doi:10.1093/joc/jqz005</p> <p>Young, Iris Marion. (1996). Communication and the other: Beyond deliberative democracy. In Seyla Benhabib (Ed.), <i>Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political</i> (pp. 120-135). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.</p>

6	17-Feb	Laws & Institutions: Encoding & Formalizing Public Life	<p>Ananny, M. (2020). Advocating for what? The nonprofit press and models of the public. In W. W. Powell & P. Bromley (Eds.), <i>The nonprofit sector</i> (3rd ed., pp. 521-538). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.</p> <p>Baker, C.E. (2002). Different democracies and their media. <i>Media, markets, and democracy</i> (pp. 129-153). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Brown, Elsa Barkley. (1994). Negotiating and transforming the public sphere: African American political life in the transition from slavery to freedom. <i>Public Culture</i>, 7, 107-146.</p> <p>Kreiss, Daniel, & McGregor, Shannon C. (2017). Technology Firms Shape Political Communication: The Work of Microsoft, Facebook, Twitter, and Google With Campaigns During the 2016 U.S. Presidential Cycle. <i>Political Communication</i>, 1-23. doi:10.1080/10584609.2017.1364814</p> <p>Pickard, Victor. (2018). The Strange Life and Death of the Fairness Doctrine: Tracing the Decline of Positive Freedoms in American Policy Discourse. <i>International Journal of Communication</i>, 12, 3434–3453.</p>
7	24-Feb	Sizes & Scales: The Politics of Counting and Making Aggregates	<p>Couture, Stephane, & Toupin, Sophie. (2019). What does the notion of “sovereignty” mean when referring to the digital? <i>New Media & Society</i>. doi:10.1177/1461444819865984</p> <p>Igo, S. (2007). Introduction: America in aggregate. <i>The averaged American: Surveys, citizens, and the making of a mass public</i> (pp. 1-22). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.</p> <p>Martin, Aryn, & Lynch, Michael. (2014). Counting Things and People: The Practices and Politics of Counting. <i>Social Problems</i>, 56(2), 243-266. doi:10.1525/sp.2009.56.2.243</p> <p>McGregor, Shannon C. (2019). Social media as public opinion: How journalists use social media to represent public opinion. <i>Journalism</i>. doi:10.1177/1464884919845458</p> <p>Peters, John Durham. (2001). "The only proper scale of representation": The politics of statistics and stories. <i>Political Communication</i>, 18, 433-449.</p> <p>Salmon, C.T., & Glasser, T.L. (1995). The politics of polling and the limits of consent. In T. L. Glasser & C. T. Salmon (Eds.), <i>Public opinion and the communication of consent</i> (pp. 437-458). New York: The Guilford Press.</p>
8	3-Mar	Special Topic: Spatial & Epistemological Scaling Visitor: Prof Andy Lakoff	<p>Collier, S. J., & Lakoff, A. (2021). <i>The Government of Emergency: Vital Systems, Expertise, and the Politics of Security</i>. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. --> selections</p> <p>Pfotenhauer, S., Laurent, B., Papageorgiou, K., & Stilgoe, J. (2021). The politics of scaling. <i>Social Studies of Science</i>, 1-32. doi:10.1177/03063127211048945</p> <p>Dahl, R. A., & Tufte, E. R. (1973). Size and democracy in political thought. In <i>Size and democracy</i> (pp. 4-16). Stanford: Stanford University Press.</p>

9	10-Mar	Time & Temporality: Making Public Rhythms	<p>Ananny, M., & Finn, M. (2020). Anticipatory news infrastructures: Seeing journalism's expectations of future publics in its sociotechnical systems. <i>New Media & Society</i>, 22(9), 1600-1618. doi:10.1177/1461444820914873</p> <p>Baker, Z. (2021). Anticipatory Culture in the Bering Sea: Weather, Climate, and Temporal Dissonance. <i>Weather, Climate, and Society</i>, 13(4), 783-795. doi:10.1175/wcas-d-21-0066.1</p> <p>Bodeker, H., & Anderson, C. W. (2019). Populist Time: Mediating Immediacy and Delay in Liberal Democracy. <i>International Journal of Communication</i>, 13.</p> <p>Cohen, E. F. (2018). Time's Political Value. In <i>The Political Value of Time: Citizenship, Duration, and Democratic Justice</i> (pp. 97-119). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Neiger, M., & Tenenboim-Weinblatt, K. (2016). Understanding journalism through a nuanced deconstruction of temporal layers in news narratives. <i>Journal of Communication</i>, 66(1), 139-160. doi:10.1111/jcom.12202</p> <p>Sugawara, S.-e. (2021). Eliminating Human Agency: Why Does Japan Abandon Predictive Simulations? <i>Science, Technology, & Human Values</i>. doi:10.1177/01622439211051777</p>
10	17-Mar	SPRING BREAK, NO CLASS	
11	24-Mar	Special Topic: Public Relations & Institutionally Making "the Environment" Visitor: Prof Melissa Aronczyk (Rutgers University)	<p>Aronczyk, M., & Espinoza, M. I. (2022). <i>A Strategic Nature: Public Relations and the Politics of American Environmentalism</i>. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. → <i>whole book</i></p>

12	31-Mar	Sociotechnical Contexts: Materiality, Infrastructure, & Design Cultures	<p>Bloch, Sam. (2019). Shade. Places. Retrieved from https://placesjournal.org/article/shade-an-urban-design-mandate/</p> <p>Callison, Candis. (2014). Introduction How climate change comes to matter: The communal life of facts (pp. 1-38). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.</p> <p>Coleman, Gabriella. (2011). Hacker politics and publics. <i>Public Culture</i>, 23(3), 511-516.</p> <p>Freelon, Deen. (2013). Discourse architecture, ideology, and democratic norms in online political discussion. <i>New Media & Society</i>. doi:10.1177/1461444813513259</p> <p>LeDantec, Christopher A. (2016). Publics and their issues, attachments, and infrastructures <i>Designing publics</i> (pp. 13-31). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.</p> <p>Marres, Nortje. (2012). The invention of material publics: Returns to American pragmatism. <i>Material participation: Technology, the environment and everyday publics</i> (pp. 28-59). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.</p>
13	7-Apr	Special Topic: Disasters & Public Information Infrastructures <i>Visitor: Prof Megan Finn (University of Washington)</i>	<p>Finn, M. (2018). <i>Documenting Aftermath: Information Infrastructures in the Wake of Disasters</i> Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. --> whole book</p>

14	14-Apr	Sociotechnical Contexts: Algorithms, Platforms, Infrastructures	<p>Burrell, J., & Fourcade, M. (2021). The Society of Algorithms. <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i>, 47, 213-237. doi:https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-090820-020800</p> <p>Gillespie, Tarleton. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski & K. A. Foot (Eds.), <i>Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society</i> (pp. 167-194). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.</p> <p>Helberger, N. (2019). On the Democratic Role of News Recommenders. <i>Digital Journalism</i>, 1-20. doi:10.1080/21670811.2019.1623700</p> <p>Hoffmann, Anna Lauren. (2019). Where fairness fails: data, algorithms, and the limits of antidiscrimination discourse. <i>Information, Communication & Society</i>, 22(7), 900-915. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2019.1573912</p> <p>Napoli, P. M. (2019). <i>Social media and the public interest</i>. New York, NY: Columbia University Press. → <i>selections</i></p> <p>Von Schnitzler, A. (2016). Introduction: Democracy's Infrastructure, Apartheid's Debris. In <i>Democracy's infrastructure: Technopolitics and protest after apartheid</i> (pp. 1-30). Princeton, NJ: Princeton.</p>
15	21-Apr	Making Public Problems & Controversies	<p>Elish, M. C. (2019). Moral Crumple Zones: Cautionary Tales in Human-Robot Interaction. <i>Engaging Science, Technology, and Society</i>, 5, 21. doi:10.17351/ests2019.260</p> <p>Goodnight, G. T. (2005). Science and Technology Controversy: A Rationale for Inquiry. <i>Argumentation and Advocacy</i>, 42(1), 26-29.</p> <p>Gusfield, J. R. (1989). Constructing the ownership of social problems: Fun and profit in the welfare state. <i>Social Problems</i>, 36(5), 431-441.</p> <p>Marres, N. (2007). The issues deserve more credit: Pragmatist contributions to the study of public involvement in controversy. <i>Social Studies of Science</i>, 37(5), 759-780.</p> <p>Venturini, T., Ricci, D., Mauri, M., Kimbell, L., & Meunier, A. (2015). Designing Controversies and Their Publics. <i>Design Issues</i>, 31(3), 74-87. doi:10.1162/DESI_a_00340</p> <p>[Browse if you can: Venturini, T., & Munk, A. K. (2022). <i>Controversy Mapping: A Field Guide</i>. London, UK: Wiley.]</p>
16	28-Apr	Final Project Presentations	

Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

a. Academic Conduct

Plagiarism

Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in [SCampus](#) in Part B, Section 11, “[Behavior Violating University Standards](#).” Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in *SCampus* and university policies on scientific misconduct, policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct.

The School of Communication maintains a commitment to the highest standards of ethical conduct and academic excellence. Any student found responsible for plagiarism, fabrication, cheating on examinations, or purchasing papers or other assignments will be reported to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards and may be dismissed from the School of Communication. There are no exceptions to the school’s policy.

In addition, it is assumed that the work you submit for this course is work you have produced entirely by yourself, and has not been previously produced by you for submission in another course, without approval of the instructor.

b. Support Systems

Counseling and Mental Health - (213) 740-9355 – 24/7 on call
studenthealth.usc.edu/counseling

Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness workshops, and crisis intervention.

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline - 1 (800) 273-8255 – 24/7 on call
suicidepreventionlifeline.org

Free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention and Services (RSVP) - (213) 740-9355(WELL), press “0” after hours – 24/7 on call
studenthealth.usc.edu/sexual-assault

Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender-based harm.

Office of Equity and Diversity (OED)- (213) 740-5086 | Title IX – (213) 821-8298
equity.usc.edu, titleix.usc.edu

Information about how to get help or help someone affected by harassment or discrimination, rights of protected classes, reporting options, and additional resources for students, faculty, staff, visitors, and applicants. The university prohibits discrimination or harassment based on the following *protected characteristics*: race, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, age, physical disability, medical condition, mental disability, marital status, pregnancy, veteran status, genetic information, and any other characteristic which may be specified in applicable laws and governmental regulations. The university also prohibits sexual assault, non-consensual sexual contact, sexual misconduct, intimate partner violence, stalking, malicious dissuasion, retaliation, and violation of interim measures.

Reporting Incidents of Bias or Harassment - (213) 740-5086 or (213) 821-8298
usc-advocate.symplcity.com/care_report

Avenue to report incidents of bias, hate crimes, and microaggressions to the Office of Equity and Diversity | Title IX for appropriate investigation, supportive measures, and response.

The Office of Student Accessibility Services - (213) 740-0776
osas.usc.edu/

Support and accommodations for students with disabilities. Services include assistance in providing readers/notetakers/interpreters, special accommodations for test taking needs, assistance with architectural barriers, assistive technology, and support for individual needs.

USC Support and Advocacy - (213) 821-4710

uscsa.usc.edu

Assists students and families in resolving complex personal, financial, and academic issues adversely affecting their success as a student.

Diversity at USC - (213) 740-2101

diversity.usc.edu

Information on events, programs and training, the Provost's Diversity and Inclusion Council, Diversity Liaisons for each academic school, chronology, participation, and various resources for students.

USC Emergency - UPC: (213) 740-4321, HSC: (323) 442-1000 – 24/7 on call

dps.usc.edu, emergency.usc.edu

Emergency assistance and avenue to report a crime. Latest updates regarding safety, including ways in which instruction will be continued if an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible.

USC Department of Public Safety - UPC: (213) 740-6000, HSC: (323) 442-120 – 24/7 on call

dps.usc.edu

Non-emergency assistance or information.

Annenberg Student Success Fund

<https://annenberg.usc.edu/current-students/resources/annenberg-scholarships-and-awards>

The Annenberg Student Success Fund is a donor-funded financial aid account available to USC Annenberg undergraduate and graduate students for non-tuition expenses related to extra- and co-curricular programs and opportunities.