

POLS 3317

Judicial Politics

Fall 2019

Department of Social Sciences
Texas A&M University- Corpus Christi

1 Instructor Information

Shane A. Gleason, PhD
Email: shane.gleason@tamucc.edu
Office: Bay Hall 339
Phone: 361.825.2168

Office Hours: Mondays: 2:00pm-4:00pm
Tuesdays: 9:00am-10:30am
Thursdays: 3:30-5:00pm
and by appointment
Class Location: Center for Instruction 138
Course Time: 11:00am to 12:15 TR

2 Course Description and Purpose

In our republican system of government the courts are the guardians of the Constitution. Clad in robes, judges project an aura of being above the fray of partisan politics. How then, do judges make their decisions? Sonia Sotomayor's 2009 confirmation hearing would suggest *who* a judge is shapes decision-making; her hearings focused in part on comments then Judge Sotomayor made where she asserted "...a wise Latina woman with the richness of her experiences would more often than not reach a better conclusion than a white male who hasn't lived that life." Is this to say she is choosing to pursue her policy preferences instead of turning into a "legal computer?" Can a judge ever truly turn off her preferences and experiences? Does the law play any role in judicial decisions? Ultimately, the answer to this question is deeply nuanced and this course explores those nuances through an exploration of the actors and institutional structures of the judiciary.

In this course, we will focus on the courts as both legal and political institutions, with an emphasis on the political nature of judicial decision-making, and how individual level factors interact with politics, law, and context to shape outcomes. While much of our time will be dedicated to the study of the Supreme Court, we will also address the role and function of lower courts at the federal, state, and international levels.

A key component of this class are your critical reading, writing, and organizational skills. Toward that end, we will read several scholarly articles over the course of the semester in addition to the more conventional textbook, to help build your critical thinking skills. I realize the scholarly literature can be daunting. To this end, we will step through each of these articles in class. Additionally, the emphasis in the exams is applying what we have covered in class to broader contexts. Since writing is a vital skill that is important regardless of your major or eventual career, you will produce a synthesis paper which explores an aspect of judicial behavior in greater depth. Feedback and direction will be provided on the synthesis paper throughout the semester.

Student Learning Outcomes

On completion of this course students will be able to:

1. Recall basic facts related to judicial behavior
2. Demonstrate understanding of key concepts relating to how institutional design shapes behavior in the judicial system.
3. Read and synthesize the scholarly literature on judicial behavior through an applied writing exercise.
4. Explain how institutional structure shapes judicial behavior.

3 Course Format

This course is heavily readings based, from both the text book and supplemental materials available on Blackboard. While the class is technically lecture based, I find class is more fun when we have a seminar discussion rather than me talking for 75 minutes. Please come prepared to discuss the readings and with any questions you might have. It is okay if you don't understand them fully, but please give it your best effort and come to class with the questions you have.

4 Requirements

Text

There is one required books, which the majority of our readings will come from. Other readings are posted on Blackboard and are noted on the course schedule.

The book is available at the campus bookstore; although it is available at a *substantially* lower rate online. To this end, I provide the ISBN for the book below. To allow time for shipping, I will place the first week's readings on Blackboard. After the first week I expect you to have the book and bring it with you to class. Unfortunately, I will not be able to place the book on course reserve at the library.

1. Miller, Mark C. 2015. *Judicial Politics in the United States*. Westview Press: Boulder, CO.
ISBN: 978-0-8133-4679-3

Assessment

This course is worth 100 points which are broken up over several different items

- Exams: 40 points
- Synthesis Paper: 40 points
- Quizzes: 10 points
- Participation: 10 points

1. **Exams (40 points)**—There are two exams, each is worth 20 points. This is to say each exam is worth two letter grades. Exams will consist of short identification terms and essays. Both exams are take-home. One week before the due date for the exam, I will post to Blackboard two essay questions and five identification terms. You must write on one of the essay questions and three of the identification terms. The exams are open book and open note, but you must work individually. The first exam is due at 11:59pm on Friday October 11. The second exam is due by the end of the final exam time slot as assigned by the University. All exams are turned in simply by uploading them to Turnitin on Blackboard.
2. **Synthesis Paper (40 points)**— Instead of a research paper, you will produce a synthesis paper that overviews the scholarly literature in one area of judicial behavior. For instance, you might be really interested in judicial elections or the role attorney gender plays in judicial-decision making. I encourage you to write on the topic you find most interesting (research is more fun when you enjoy what you're researching!). Since this is such a big project, it will be broken up into several smaller assignments spaced roughly evenly over the course of the semester. I will provide you feedback at each step along the way, which will help guide you as you move forward. More details are provided in the Synthesis Paper Project handout on Blackboard. For now though, suffice to say that the Statement of Interest is due September 3, the Proposal is due October 4, the Rough Draft is November 1 , and the Final Draft is due December 6.
3. **Quizzes (10 points)**— Periodically throughout the semester I will administer unannounced quizzes. These quizzes will be given at the start of class and will consist of multiple choice, true or false, fill in the blank, and/or short answer items. They can cover anything previously discussed in class or anything from that day's readings. Quizzes will be passed out at exactly 11:00AM and no quizzes will be passed out after that time, so it is important to arrive to class on time. There will be a total of seven quizzes; I will take your top five quizzes over the course of the semester to compile your total quiz score (with each worth 2% of your final grade). Quizzes cannot be made up, therefore it is imperative you attend class regularly, read for class, and are on time for class.
4. **Participation (10 points)**– Class is more fun when it is not just me talking and I will accordingly call on students to provide summaries of the readings. I am aware, however, that not everyone is an outgoing person that enjoys talking. To this end, I consider active listening to be participation.

Assessment Scale

A: 90-100	B: 80-89.9	C: 70-79.9	D: 60-69.9	F: <59.9
-----------	------------	------------	------------	----------

Sensitive Topics

Since politics is a reflection of the society in which we live, we will cover several topics which touch on topics which might be sensitive such as the role of sexual assault allegations in judicial confirmation hearings, gay rights, and litigation over the constitutionality of abortion. These topics are included because we cannot adequately study judicial politics without covering them. My personal policy is to remain neutral (I'm a political scientist, emphasis on the second word). I encourage disagreement, but it must be done in a respectful way. You have my assurance that

I will do everything reasonably related to keeping these discussions civil and academic. I know aspects of this course may be emotionally difficult. You may personally connect with or be affected by some of the material covered in this course, so I urge you to identify a support system outside of this class. I am happy to meet with you to discuss any concerns or accommodation needs, but I also encourage you to seek out confidential or other resources.

5 Course Policies

Contacting the Instructor

I am happy to help you either via e-mail, office telephone, or in-person during office hours. Of course, if office hours do not fit your schedule let me know and we can schedule a meeting at a time that is more convenient. If you come to office hours you should come prepared; bring your book, notes, and read the material in advance. If you contact me via e-mail, I will respond within 48 hours, though in most cases it will be less than six hours. However, in any e-mail you must identify yourself and use proper format which consists of an opening (As simple as the recipient's name), a closing (as simple as your name), and a descriptive subject line. If you do not follow that convention or if you use Internet shorthand (ie: "u" instead of "you,") I will not reply to the message. Telephone calls will be returned as soon as possible, though e-mail is usually quicker. Please note, the phone number listed is my office phone; it cannot receive text messages.

Make-up Exams and Assignments

To qualify for a make-up test a student must notify me of the absence in advance via e-mail and provide documentation. Make-up exams will be a written research paper.

Papers are due in hard copy **and** digitally on Turnitin at the beginning of the class on the date indicated in the schedule. I will not accept e-mail copies or papers placed under my door. Please do not be afraid to print multiple rough drafts and revise them before turning them in. I am happy to look at drafts and help you with crafting your final paper. I do not accept excuses about dogs, computers, or traffic. Be responsible.

Extra Credit

The only extra credit I offer is a one point increase on each paper grade (remember, the course is only worth 100 points) for visiting the writing center. Appointments are usually necessary for the writing center. When visiting the writing center, be sure to ask them to send me a report about your visit.

Academic Honor Code

Students are expected to uphold the Academic Honor Code published in the University Student Handbook. The Academic Honor Code is based on the premise that each student has the responsibility (1) to uphold the highest standards of academic integrity in the student's own work, (2) to refuse to tolerate violations of academic integrity in the university community, and (3) to foster a high sense of integrity and social responsibility on the part of the university community. Violations

of the Academic Honor Code will not be tolerated.

Academic dishonesty, cheating, and plagiarism of any kind are unacceptable. There are no exceptions. Consequences for academic dishonesty, cheating, and plagiarism include, but are not limited to, a failing grade for an assignment or exam, a failing grade for the course, noncredit for an assignment or exam, additional work, and/or direct referral to university officials.

If academic dishonesty, cheating, or plagiarism is suspected on any assessment, the instructor reserves the right to impose restrictions and make changes on future assessments for an individual and/or the entire class as needed.

Please also note that the university requires that faculty members formally report all instances of academic misconduct. Here are the official procedures: http://judicialaffairs.tamucc.edu/assets/procedure_academicmisconductcases.pdf

Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, the use of unauthorized information during a quiz or exam, plagiarism, submitting the same paper for multiple courses without permission, or depriving another student of the ability to perform his or her work. The term cheating includes, but is not limited to: (1) use of any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes, tests, or examinations; (2) dependence upon the aid of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments, plagiarism; or (3) the acquisition, without permission, of tests or other academic material belonging to a member of the university faculty or staff. The term plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, the use by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgment. Plagiarism also includes the unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling or distribution of term papers or other academic materials. If you have questions about the university's policy on academic dishonesty, please see the Student Code of Conduct at <http://judicialaffairs.tamucc.edu/StudentCofC.html>.

Please note "plagiarism" includes intentionally, knowingly, or carelessly presenting the work of another as one's own. Additionally, the procedure has been updated to reflect the Academic Integrity Committee as the body to consider grade appeals and academic misconduct cases, as well as identifies the selection process of committee members. Detailed information can be found on the University Handbook of Rules and Procedures website. Contact for interpretation or clarification is the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Students with Disabilities

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please call or visit Disability Services at (361) 825-5816 in Corpus Christi Hall 116.

If you are a returning veteran and are experiencing cognitive and/or physical access issues in the classroom or on campus, please contact the Disability Services office for assistance at (361) 825-5816.

Student Caregivers: If you have caregiving responsibilities (e.g., parent of a child or care for elderly parents) and you anticipate scheduling difficulties, please discuss this with me the beginning of the semester to work out an appropriate strategy in advance.

Sexual Assault & Gender Based Discrimination

TAMUCC faculty is fully committed to supporting students and upholding an environment free of sexual violence and gender based discrimination. If a student chooses to confide in faculty (or other entities on campus) regarding an issues of sexual violence, dating violence, domestic violence and stalking it should be understood that faculty members are often obligated to report this information. Students can choose to disclose their experience confidentially to the following resources:

- University Counseling Center
- Student Health Center

Academic Advising (for students with a majors in the College of Liberal Arts)

The College of Liberal Arts requires that students meet with an Academic Advisor as soon as they are ready to declare a major. Degree plans are prepared in the CLA Academic Advising Center. The University uses an online Degree Audit system. Any amendment must be approved by the Department Chair and the Office of the Dean. All courses and requirements specified in the final degree plan audit must be completed before a degree will be granted. The CLA Academic Advising Office is located in Driftwood #203. For more information please call 361-825-3466.

Dropping a Class

I hope that you never find it necessary to drop this or any other class. However, events can sometimes occur that make dropping a course necessary or wise. Please consult with your academic advisor, the Financial Aid Office, and me, before you decide to drop this course. Should dropping the course be the best course of action, you must initiate the process to drop the course by going to the Student Services Center and filling out a course drop form. Just stopping attendance and participation **WILL NOT** automatically result in your being dropped from the class. **November 8, 2019** is the last day to drop a class with an automatic grade of “W” this term.

Grade Appeals

As stated in University Procedure 13.02.99.C2.03, Student Grade Appeals, a student who believes that he or she has not been held to appropriate academic standards as outlined in the class syllabus, equitable evaluation procedures, or appropriate grading, may appeal the final grade given in the course. The burden of proof is upon the student to demonstrate the appropriateness of the appeal. A student with a complaint about a grade is encouraged to first discuss the matter with the instructor. For complete details, including the responsibilities of the parties involved in the process and the number of days allowed for completing the steps in the process, see University Procedure 13.02.99.C2.03, Student Grade Appeals. These documents are accessible online at: http://academicaffairs.tamucc.edu/rules_procedures/assets/13.02.99.C0.03_student_grade_appeals.pdf. For assistance and/or guidance in the grade appeal process, students may contact the Associate Dean’s office in the college in which the course is taught. For

complete details on the process of submitting a formal grade appeal in CLA, please visit the College of Liberal Arts website, <http://cla.tamucc.edu/about/student-resources.html>.

Statement of Academic Continuity

In the event of an unforeseen adverse event, such as a major hurricane and classes could not be held on the campus of Texas A&M University Corpus Christi; this course would continue through the use of Blackboard and/or email. In addition, the syllabus and class activities may be modified to allow continuation of the course. Ideally, University facilities (i.e., emails, web sites, and Blackboard) will be operational within two days of the closing of the physical campus. However, students need to make certain that the course instructor has a primary and a secondary means of contacting each student.

Classroom Courtesy

Classroom courtesy is an essential component of creating an effective learning environment. All students have the right to learn without unnecessary distractions. These distractions include: cell phones, talking during lectures (unless recognized by the instructor), reading newspapers, falling asleep, etc. If you need a cell phone for emergency purposes, leave it on vibrate. Entering and leaving are also significant sources of distraction. It is your responsibility to be on time and to stay for the entire period. In circumstances where you need to leave early, tell the instructor beforehand. Repeated disruptions of class will lead to a reduction in your final grade.

Most importantly, the syllabus includes many sensitive topics which can lead to strong feelings and heated debate. Because this is a college classroom, all discussion must be respectful and scholarly. This is to say you must be respectful, in both content and tone, of diverse opinions and not make personal or partisan attacks.

Acceptable Comments

- are respectful of diverse opinions and open to follow up questions and/or disagreement
- are related to class and/or the course material
- focus on advancing the discussion about issues related to the course and/or course material rather than personal beliefs, and
- are delivered in normal tones and a non-aggressive manner.

Unacceptable Comments

- are personal in nature. This includes attacks on a person's appearance, demeanor, or political beliefs.
- include interrupting the instructor or other students. Raise your hand and wait to be recognized.
- often use the discussion to argue for political positions and/or beliefs. If political discussions arise, they must be discussed in a scholarly way (see above).
- may include using raised tones, yelling, engaging in arguments with other students and being threatening in any manner.

- include ignoring the instructor’s authority to maintain the integrity of the classroom environment.

Syllabus Change Policy

This syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advanced notice. These changes may come via e-mail. Make sure to check your university supplied email regularly. You are accountable for all such communications.

6 Tentative Course Schedule

A few notes about reading the course schedule:

- “*Miller*” refers to the required Miller book
- “(B)” means that reading can be found on Blackboard

Course Introduction

Tuesday August 27– Introduction to the Course

- *No readings*

Judicial Behavior Basics

Thursday August 29– Judicial Behavior Basics

- Miller: Chapter 2
- Miller: Chapter 7

Models of Judicial Decision Making

Tuesday September 3– The Legal & Attitudinal Models

- Miller: Chapter 8
- Baum, Lawrence. 1994. “What Judges Want: Judges’ Goals and Judicial Behavior.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 47: 749-768. (B)

Thursday September 5– Library Research Tutorial

- Powner, Leanne. 2015. *Emperical Research and Writing: A Political Science Student’s Practical Guide*. Congressional Quarterly Press: Washington. (Chapter 3: “Doing Pre-Research”). (B)
- *Class meets in Library 216A*

Tuesday September 10– The Legal & Attitudinal Models (cont.)

- Epstein, Lee, Valerie Hoekstra, Jeffrey A. Segal, and Harold J. Spaeth. 1998. “Do Political Preferences Change? A Longitudinal Study of U.S. Supreme Court Justices.” *Journal of Politics*. 60: 801-818. (B)

Thursday September 12– Beyond Attitudes

- Harris, Allison and Maya Sen. 2019. “Bias in Judging.” *Annual Review of Political Science*. 22:41-59. **(B)**

Judicial Selection

Tuesday September 17– Judicial Selection in the Federal Courts

- Epstein, Lee and Jeffrey A. Segal. 2005. *Advice and Consent: The Politics of Judicial Appointments*. Oxford University Press: New York. (selections) **(B)** (*skim this one*)
- Cameron, Charles M., Albert D. Cover, and Jeffrey A. Segal. 1990. “Senate Voting on Supreme Court Nominees: A Neoinstitutional Model.” *American Political Science Review*. 84(2): 525-534. **(B)**

Thursday September 19– Judicial Selection (cont.)

- Shipan, Charles R. and Megan L. Shannon. 2003. “Delaying Justice(s): A Duration Analysis of Supreme Court Confirmations.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 47(4):654-668. **(B)**
- Solberg, Rorie Spill and Jennifer Segal Diascro. 2018. “A Retrospective on Obama’s Judges: Diversity, Intersectionality, and Symbolic Representation.” *Politics, Groups, & Identities*. XX:1-17 **(B)**

Other Actors at the Court

Tuesday September 24— Interest Groups

- Miller: Chapter 9 (*just pages 213-224*)
- Collins, Paul. 2018. “The Use of Amicus Briefs.” *Annual Review of Law & Social Sciences*. 14:219-237. **(B)**

Thursday September 26– Attorneys

- McGuire, Kevin T. 1995. “Repeat Players in the Supreme Court: The Role of Experienced Lawyers in Litigation Success.” *Journal of Politics*. 57:187-196. **(B)**
- Wilson, Joshua C. and Amanda Hollis-Brusky. 2018. “Higher Law: Can Christian Conservatives Transform Law Through Legal Education?” *Law & Society Review*. XX:1-36. **(B)**

The Court & Executives

Tuesday October 1– The President & The Court

- Miller: Chapter 11
- Wohlfarth, Patrick C. 2009. “The Tenth Justice? Consequences of Politicization in the Solicitor General’s Office.” *Journal of Politics*. 71(1):224-237.

Thursday October 3– State Attorneys General

- Gleason, Shane A. and Colin Provost. 2016. “Representing the States Before the U.S. Supreme Court: State Amicus Brief Participation, the Policy-Making Environment and the Fourth Amendment.” *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*. 46(2): 248-273. **(B)**
- Nolette, Paul. 2014. “State Litigation During the Obama Administration: Diverging Agendas in an Era of Polarized Politics.” *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*. 44(3): 451-474. **(B)**

The Court, Congress, & the Bureaucracy

Tuesday October 8– Congress & The Court

- Miller: Chapter 10
- Ringsmuth, Eve and Timothy R. Johnson. 2013. “Supreme Court Oral Arguments and Institutional Maintenance.” *American Politics Research*. 41:651-673. **(B)**

Thursday October 10– The Court & The Bureaucracy

- Miller: Chapter 12
- Johnson, Gbemende. 2014. “Judicial Deference and Executive Control Over Administrative Agencies.” *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*. 14(2):142-164. **(B)**

From Petition to Decision

Tuesday October 15– Getting to the Court

- Black, Ryan C. and Ryan J. Owens. 2012. “Supreme Court Agenda Setting: Policy Uncertainty and Legal Considerations.” in *New Directions in Judicial Politics*. ed: Kevin T. McGuire. Routledge: New York. **(B)**
- Goelzhauser, Greg and Nicole Vouvalis. 2013. “State Coordinating Institutions and Agenda Setting on the U.S. Supreme Court.” *American Politics Research*. 41(5):819-838. **(B)**

Thursday October 17– Oral Arguments

- Johnson, Timothy R. 2001. “Information, Oral Arguments, and Supreme Court Decision-Making.” *American Politics Research*. 29(4):331-351. **(B)**
- Ringsmuth, Eve, Amanda C. Bryan, and Timothy R. Johnson. 2013. “Voting Fluidity and Oral Arguments on the U.S. Supreme Court.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 66:429-440. **(B)**

Tuesday October 22– New Directions in Oral Arguments

- Dietrich, Bryce J, Ryan D. Enos, and Maya Sen. 2017. “Emotional Arousal Predicts Voting on the U.S. Supreme Court.” *Political Analysis*. XX:1-7. **(B)**
- Patton, Dana and Joseph L. Smith. 2017. “Lawyer, Interrupted: Gender Bias in Oral Arguments at the U.S. Supreme Court.” *Journal of Law & Courts*. 5:337-361. **(B)**

Thursday October 24– Opinion Writing

- Clark, Tom S. 2012. “Bargaining and Opinion Writing on the U.S. Supreme Court.” in *New Directions in Judicial Politics*. ed: Kevin T. McGuire. Routledge: New York. **(B)**.
- Corley, Pamela C. 2008. “The Supreme Court and Opinion Content.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 61:468-478. **(B)**

Tuesday October 29– Opinion Writing (cont.)

- Wahlbeck, Paul J., James F. Spriggs, and Lee Sigelman. 2002. “Ghostwriters on the Court? A Stylistic Analysis of U.S. Supreme Court Opinion Drafts.” *American Politics Research*. 30(2):166-192. **(B)**
- Spriggs, James F. and Paul J. Wahlbeck. 1997. “Amicus Curiae and the Role of Information at the Supreme Court.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 50:365-386. **(B)**

State Courts

Thursday October 31– State Court Selection Mechanisms

- Hume, Robert J. 2018. *Judicial Behavior and Policymaking: An Introduction*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield. Chapter 2 **(B)**
- Goelzhauser, Greg. 2018. “Classifying Judicial Selection Institutions.” *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*. XX:1-19 **(B)**

Tuesday November 5– State Supreme Court Decision Making

- Hall, Melinda Gann. 2014. “Representation in State Supreme Courts: Evidence from the Terminal Term.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 67:335-346. **(B)**
- Hinkle, Rachael K. and Michael J. Nelson. 2016. “The Transmission of Legal Precedent Among State Supreme Courts in the Twenty-First Century.” *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*. 16(4):391-410. **(B)**

The Lower Federal Courts & Comparative Courts

Thursday November 7– The Federal Courts of Appeal

- Martinek, Wendy L. 2009. “Appellate Workhorses of the Federal Judiciary: The U.S. Courts of Appeals.” in *Exploring Judicial Politics*. Mark C. Miller ed. Oxford University Press: New York. **(B)**
- Smith, Joseph L. 2014. “Law, Fact, and the Threat of Reversal From Above.” *American Politics Research*. 42(2):226-256. **(B)**

Tuesday November 12– The Federal District Courts

- Barnes, Jeb. 2009. “U.S. District Courts, Litigation, and the Policy-Making Process.” in *Exploring Judicial Politics*. Mark C. Miller ed. Oxford University Press: New York. **(B)**
- Boyd, Christina L. 2015. “Opinion Writing in the Federal District Courts.” *Justice System Journal*. 36(3):254-273. **(B)**

Thursday November 14– Comparative Courts

- Miller: Chapter 12
- Helmke, Gretchen. 2002. “The Logic of Strategic Defection: Court-Executive Relations in Argentina Under Dictatorship and Democracy.” *American Political Science Review*. 96(2):291-303. **(B)**

Gender & Courts

Tuesday November 19– Gender & Judicial Decision-Making

- Haire, Susan B. and Laura P. Moyer. 2015. *Diversity Matters: Judicial Policy Making in the U.S. Courts of Appeals*. University of Virginia Press: Charlottesville, VA. Chapter 2 **(B)**
- Tillman, Elizabeth A. and Rachael K. Hinkle. 2018. “Of Whites and Men: How Gender and Race Impact Authorship of Published and Unpublished Opinion in the U.S. Courts of Appeals.” *Research & Politics*. XX:1-7. **(B)**

Thursday November 21– Gender at Home & Abroad

- Kaheny, Erin B., John J. Szmer, and Tammy A. Sarver. 2011. “Women Lawyers Before the Supreme Court of Canada.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 44(1):83-109. **(B)**
- Gleason, Shane A. 2019. “Beyond Mere Presence: Gender Norms in Oral Arguments at the U.S. Supreme Court.” *Political Research Quarterly*. XX:1-13. **(B)**

Tuesday November 26– Gender in State Courts

- Gill, Rebecca D. and Kate Eugenis. 2019. “Do Voters Prefer Women Judges? Deconstructing the Competitive Advantage in State Supreme Court Elections.” *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*. XX:1-25. **(B)**

Thursday November 28– **NO CLASS: THANKSGIVING**

- *Enjoy your day!*

The Supreme Court & the Public

Tuesday December 3– Public Opinion

- Miller: Chapter 9 (*just pages 203-213*)
- Caldeira, Gregory A. 1987. “Public Opinion and the U.S. Supreme Court: FDR’s Court-Packing Plan.” *American Political Science Review*. 81(4):1139-1153. **(B)**

Thursday December 5– **NO CLASS: READING DAY**

- *Good luck studying!*

Final Exam: Due by 1:45pm on Tuesday December 10, via Blackboard