

Cognitive Science Psy 718

Description: Our primary focus in this seminar will be discussion and critical evaluation of some of the main topics in the cognitive sciences. We will read and discuss articles from disciplines that comprise cognitive science (philosophy, cognition, computer science, artificial intelligence). Each week one student will lead discussion about the assigned articles and one additional article. Assigned articles are available on WebCampus.

Everyone is expected to read all of the assigned articles and, each week, everyone (except the presenter) will submit 2 questions or discussion points designed to stimulate class discussion (these are due in class as a typed hard copy). Your grade will be based on your participation in discussion, the questions/discussion points and presentations, and a paper.

38% Weekly Participation: This course is a discussion-based course, which means that every student is expected to participate in the discussion. Two questions about the readings are due in class each week. Students will mark which question (or questions) they asked in class and turn that in at the end of class. Participation is worth 38% of your grade and will be recorded for each class.

38% Presentations: Presentations of articles are to be done in PowerPoint (or the equivalent). Presenters are expected to be able to explain the papers (answer questions, correct misunderstandings, which will often require going outside of the assigned readings) but the presentations should be designed with the goal of stimulating discussion. Presenters should treat the presentation as a combination of a lecture and a symposium; the presentation is geared to clarifying and organizing the ideas, but more importantly, integrating them and guiding discussion about them. Thus, presenters are expected to raise questions for discussion, particularly those that go beyond individual papers. As part of the presentation, students are expected to find one additional paper and one additional “piece” from the popular media related to the topic. With respect to the popular media, the goal is to find something in the news, movies, books, blogs, etc. that is relevant to the topic that will promote discussion (e.g., how long do you think it will be before technology used in the Matrix could work?)

Each student will lead two discussions and will meet with me at least one week before that discussion.

24% Paper: One critical review paper or experiment proposal is required (minimum 12 pages, minimum 10 references outside of class readings), due on May 12th. The topic of the paper must be approved and is due midway through the semester (March 13th). Although your paper may be related to the topic(s) of your personal research, you may not write a paper about ongoing or planned research; the paper must be novel. The “paper topic” submission must include a short summary of the topic and point of the paper, not just the names of topics (it should be somewhere around a page long).

Tentative Schedule		
	Presenter	Topic
1/21	Organization & Overview	

1/28	Representations
2/4	Cognitive Architectures
2/11	Embodied Cognition
2/18	Evolutionary Cognition
2/25	Perception
3/3	Neuroscience
3/10	Attention & Working Memory
3/17	Memory
3/24	
3/31	Language
4/7	Free Will & Brain Reading
4/14	Brain Computer Interaction
4/21	Consciousness
4/28	
5/5	Artificial Intelligence
5/12	Paper Due

LIST OF READINGS

In suggested reading order

1/21 Week 1: Overview

Motz, B. (2013). Cognitive science in popular film: the cognitive science movie index. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17, 483-484.

1/28 Week 2: Representations

Markman, A. B., & Dietrich, E. (2000). Extending the classical view of representation. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4, 470-475.

Pylyshyn, Z. (2003). Return of the mental image: are there really pictures in the brain? *Trends in cognitive Sciences*, 7, 113 – 118.

Kosslyn, S.M., Ganis, G., & Thompson, W.L. (2003). Mental imagery: against the nihilistic hypothesis. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7, 109-111.

Pearson, J., Naselaris, T., Holmes, E.A., & Kosslyn, S.M. (2015). Mental imagery: functional mechanisms and clinical applications. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 19, 590-602.

Background

Clark, A. (1997). Being There: Putting Brain, Body, and World Together Again. Ch. 8. *The MIT Press*.

O'Brien, G., & Opie, J. (2009). The role of representation in computation. *Cognitive Processes*, 10, 53-62.

O'Reilly, R.C. (2006). Biologically based computational models of high-level cognition. *Science*, 314, 91-94.

2/4 Week 3: Cognitive Architectures

- Van Gelder, T. (1998). The dynamical process in cognitive science. *Behavior and Brain Sciences*, 21, 615-628. (comments section optional)
- McClelland, et al. (2010). Letting structure emerge: connectionist and dynamical systems approaches to cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 14, 348-356.
- Griffiths, T.L., Chater, N., Kemp, C., Perfors, A. & Tenenbaum, J.B. (2010). Probabilistic models of cognition: exploring representations and inductive biases. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 14, 357-364.

Background

- Beer, R.D. (2000). Dynamical approaches to cognitive science. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4, 91-99.
- McClelland, J.L., & Rumelhart, D.E. (1981). An interactive activation model of context effects in letter perception: Part 1. An account of basic findings. *Psychological Review*, 88, 375-407.
- Fodor, J.A., & Pylyshyn, Z.W. (1988). Connection and cognitive architecture: A critical analysis. *Cognition*, 28, 3-71.
- Clark, A. (2014). *Mindware: an introduction to the philosophy of cognitive science*. Ch. 4. Oxford University Press.
- Rabinovich, M.I., Simmons, A.N., Varona, P. (2015). Dynamical bridge between brain and mind. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 19, 453-461.

2/11 Week 4: Embodied Cognition

- Wilson, M. (2002). Six views of embodied cognition. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 9, 625-636.
- Barsalou, L.W., Simmons, W.K., Barbey, A.K., & Wilson, C.D. (2003). Grounding conceptual knowledge in modality-specific systems. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7, 84-91.
- Engel, A.K., Maye, A., Kurthen, M., & Konig, P. (2013). Where's the action? The pragmatic turn in cognitive science. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17, 202-209.

Background

- Pylyshyn, Z. (2000). Situating vision in the world. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4, 197-207.
- Kyselo, M., & Di Paolo, E. (2015). Locked-in syndrome: a challenge for embodied cognitive science. *Phenomenology and Cognitive Sciences*, 14, 517-542.
- Pylyshyn, Z.W. (2000). Situating vision in the world. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4, 197-207.

2/18 Week 5 Evolutionary Cognition

- Buss, D.M., Haselton, M.G., Shackelford, T.K., Bleske, A.L., & Wakefield, J.C. (1998). Adaptations, exaptations, and spandrels. *American Psychologist*, 53, 533-548.
- Marcus, G.F. (2006). Cognitive architecture and descent with modification. *Cognition*, 101, 443-465.
- Nowak, M.A., & Komarova, N.L. (2001). Towards an evolutionary theory of language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 5, 288-295.

Background

- De Waal, F.B.M., & Ferrari, P.F. (2010). Towards a bottom-up perspective on animal and human cognition. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 14, 201-207.
- Confer, J.C., Easton, D.S., Fleischman, C.D, Lewis, D.M.G, Perilloux, C., & Buss, D.M. (2010). Evolutionary psychology: Controversies, questions, prospects, and limitations. *American Psychologist*, 65, 110-126.
- Morand-Ferron, J. & Quinn, J.L. (2015). The evolution of cognition in natural populations. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 19, 235-237.
- Corballis, M.C. (2013). Mental time travel: a case of evolutionary continuity. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17, 5-6.

2/25 Week 6: Perception

- Treisman, A. (1998). Feature binding, attention and object perception. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B*, 353, 1295-1306.
- Di Lollo, V. (2012). The feature-binding problem is an ill-posed problem. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16, 317-321.
- Wolfe, J.M. (2012). The binding problem lives on: comment on Di Lollo. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16, 307-308.
- Di Lollo, V. (2012). Response to Wolfe: feature-binding and object perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16, 308-309.
- Noe, A., Pessoa, L., & Thompson, E. (2000). Beyond the grand illusion: What change blindness really teaches us about vision. *Visual Cognition*, 7, 93-106.
- Simons, D.J. & Rensink, R.A. (2006). Change blindness: past, present, and future. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 9, 16-20.
- Noe, A. (2006). What does change blindness teach us about consciousness? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 9, 218.

Background

- Clarke, A., & Tyler, L.K. (2015). Understanding what we see: how we derive meaning from vision. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 19, 677-687.

3/3 Week 7: Neuroscience

- Churchland, P.S. (2007). Neurophilosophy: the early years and new directions. *Functional Neurology*, 22, 185-195.
- Poldrack, R.A. (2006). Can cognitive processes be inferred from neuroimaging data? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10, 59-63.
- Henson, R. (2006). Forward inference using functional neuroimaging: dissociations versus associations. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10, 64-69.
- Bassett, D. S., & Gazzaniga, M.S. (2011). Understanding complexity in the human brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 15, 200-209.

- Carandini, M. (2012). From circuits to behavior: a bridge too far? *Nature Neuroscience*, *15*, 507-509.
- Adolphs, R. (2015). The unsolved problems of neuroscience. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *19*, 173-175.

Background

- King, J-R., & Dehaene, S. (2014). Characterizing the dynamics of mental representations: the temporal generalization method. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *18*, 203-210.

3/10 Week 8: Attention and Working Memory

- Zhang, W., & Luck, S.J. (2011). The number and quality of representations in working memory. *Psychological Science*, *22*, 1434-1441.
- Krauzlis, R.J., Bollimunta, A., Arcizet, F. & Wang, L. (2014). Attention as an effect not a cause. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *18*, 457-464.
- Hasson, U., Chen, J., Honey, C.J. (2015). Hierarchical process memory: memory as an integral component of information processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *19*, 304-313.
- Soto, D., & Silvanto, J. (2014). Reappraising the relationship between working memory and conscious awareness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *14*, 520-525.
- Bays, P.M. (2015). Spikes not slots: noise in neural populations limits working memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *19*, 431-438.

Background

- Stokes, M.G. (2015). 'Activity-silent' working memory in prefrontal cortex: a dynamic coding framework. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *19*, 394-405.

3/17 Week 9: Memory

- O'Reilly, R.C., & Norman, K.A. (2002). Hippocampal and neocortical contributions to memory: advances in the complementary learning systems framework. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *6*, 505-510.
- Olsen, R.K., Moses, S.N., Riggs, L., & Ryan, J.D. (2012). The hippocampus supports multiple cognitive processes through relational binding and comparison. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *6*, 1-13.
- Dennis, N.A., Bowman, C.R., & Vandekar, S.N. (2012). True and phantom recollection: An fMRI investigation of similar and distinct neural correlates and connectivity. *NeuroImage*, *19*, 2982-2993.
- Ramirez, S. et al. (2013). Creating a false memory in the hippocampus. *Science*, *341*, 387-391.
- Shaw, J. & Porter, S. (2015). Constructing rich false memories of committing crime. *Psychological Science*, *26*, 291-301.

Background

- Glenberg, A. (1997). What memory is for. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *20*, 1-55.
- Schacter, D.L., Guerin, S.A., & St. Jacques, P.L. (2011). Memory distortion: an adaptive perspective. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *15*, 467-474.

Stark, C.E.L., Okado, Y., & Loftus, E.F. (2010). Imaging the reconstruction of true and false memories using sensory reactivation and the misinformation paradigms. *Learning & Memory, 17*, 1549-1585.

3/31 Week 10 Language

Clark, A. (2006). Language, embodiment, and the cognitive niche. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 10*, 370-374.

Zwaan, R.A. (2014). Embodiment and language comprehension: reframing the discussion. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 18*, 229-234.

Regier, T., & Kay, P. (2009). Language, thought, and color: Whorf was half right. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 13*, 439-446.

Berwick, R.C., Friederici, A.D., Chomsky, N., & Bolhuis, J.J. (2013). Evolution, brain, and the nature of language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 17*, 89-98.

Background

Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, I., Schlewsky, M., Small, S.L., & Rauschecker, J.P. (2015). Neurobiological roots of language in primate audition: common computational properties. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 19*, 142-152.

4/7 Week 11: Free Will & Brain Reading

Soon, C.S., Brass, M., Hans-Jochen, H., & Haynes, J. (2008). Unconscious determinants of free decisions in the human brain. *Nature Neuroscience, 11*, 543-545.

Lau, H.C., Rogers, R.D., Passingham, R.E. (2007). Manipulating the experienced onset of intention after action execution. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 19*, 81-90.

Cowen, A.S., Chun, M.M., & Kuhl, B.A. (2014). Neural portraits of perception: Reconstruction face images from evoked brain activity. *NeuroImage, 94*, 12 – 22.

Bergstrom, Z.M., Anderson, M.C., Buda, M., Simons, J.S., & Richardson-Klavehn, A. (2013). Intentional retrieval suppression can conceal guilty knowledge in ERP memory detection tests. *Biological Psychology, 94*, 1 -11.

Background

Bode, S.H., A.H., Soon, C.S., Trampel, R., Turner, R., Haynes J. (2011). Tracking the unconscious generation of free decisions using ultra-high field fMRI. *PLoS ONE, 6*, 1-13.

Fried, I., Mucamel, R., & Kreiman, G. (2011). Internally generated preactivation of single neurons in human medial frontal cortex predicts volition. *Neuron, 69*, 548-562.

Klemm, W.R. (2010). Free will debates: Simple experiments are not so simple. *Advances in Cognitive Psychology, 6*, 47 – 65.

Langleben, D.D., & Moriarty, J.C. (2013). Using brain imaging for lie detection: Where science, law, and policy collide. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 19*, 222 – 234.

Libet, B. (1999). Do we have free will? *Journal of Consciousness Studies, 6*, 47-57.

- Miller, K.J., Schalk, G., Hermes, D., Ojemann, J.G., Rao, R.P.N. (2016). Spontaneous decoding of the timing and content of human object perception from cortical surface recording reveals complementary information in the event-related potential and broadband spectral change. *PLOS Computational Biology*. DOI:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004660
- Schultz-Kraft, M. et al. (2016). The point of no return in vetoing self-initiated movements. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 1080-1085.

4/14 Week 12: Brain Computer Interface

- Donoghue, J.P. (2008). Bridging the brain to the world: a perspective on neural interface systems. *Neuron*, 60, 511-521.
- deCharms, R.C. (2007). Reading and controlling human brain activation using real-time functional magnetic imaging. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 439-446.
- Tan, D.W., Schiefer, M.A., Keith, M.W., Anderson, J., Tyler, J., & Tyler, D.J. (2014). A neural interface provides long-term stable natural touch perception. *Science Translational Medicine*, 6, 1-11.
- Sellers, E.W., Ryan, D.B., Hauser, C.K. (2014). Noninvasive brain-computer interface enables communication after brainstem stroke. *Science Translational Medicine*, 6, 1-7.

Background

- Aflalo, T. et al. (2015). Decoding motor imagery from the posterior parietal cortex of a tetraplegic human. *Science*, 348, 906-910.
- Lee, H., Fell, J., & Axmacher, N. (2013). Electrical engram: how deep brain stimulation affects memory. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 13, 574-584.
- Thakor, N.V. (2013). Translating the brain-machine interface. *Science Translational Medicine*, 5, 1-7.
- Tong, F. & Pratte, M.S. (2012). Decoding patterns of human brain activity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 473-481.

4/21 Week 13: Consciousness

- Cohen, M.A., & Dennett, D.C. (2011). Consciousness cannot be separated from function. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 15, 358-364.
- Tsuchiya, N., Block, N., & Koch, C. (2012). Top-down attention and consciousness: comment on Cohen et al. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16, 527.
- Fahrenfort, J.J., & Lamme, V.A.F. (2012). A true science of consciousness explains phenomenology: comment on Cohen and Dennett. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16, 138-139.
- Cohen, M.A., & Dennett, D.C. (2012). Response to Fahrenfort and Lamme: defining reportability, accessibility and sufficiency in conscious awareness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16, 139-140.
- Engle, A.K., & Singer, W. (2001). Temporal binding and the neural correlates of sensory awareness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 5, 16-25.

- Graziano, M.S.A. (2014). Speculations on the evolution of awareness. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 26, 1300-1304.
- Casali, A.G., et al. (2013). A theoretically based index of consciousness independent of sensory processing and behavior. *Science Translational Medicine*, 5, 1-10

Background

- Bargh, J.A., & Chartrand, T.L. (1999). The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist*, 54, 462-479.
- Graziano, M.S.A., & Kastner, S. (2011). Human consciousness and its relationship to social neuroscience: A novel hypothesis. *Cognitive Neuroscience*, 2, 98-133.
- Nagel, T. (1974). What is it like to be a bat? *The Philosophical Review*, 83, 435-450.
- Suhler, C. & Churchland, P.S. (2009). Control: conscious and otherwise. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 13, 341-347.
- Tsuchiya, N., Wilke, M., Frassle, S., & Lamme, V.A.F. (2015). No-report paradigms: Extracting the true neural correlates of consciousness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 19, 757-770.
- Zelazo, P.D. (2004). The development of conscious control in childhood. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8, 12-17.

5/5 Week 14: Artificial Intelligence

- French, R.M. (2000). The Turing test: the first 50 years. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4, 115-122.
- Searle, J. (1990). Is the brain's mind a computer program? *Scientific American*.
- Harnad, S. (2001). What's wrong and what's right about Searle's Chinese room argument? In: M. Bishop & J. Preston (eds.) *Essays on Searle's Chinese Room Argument*. Oxford University Press.
- Ferrucci, D., Levas, A., Bagchi, S., Gondek, D., & Mueller, E.T. (2013). Watson: Beyond Jeopardy! *Artificial Intelligence*, 199, 93-105.
- Murphy, R.R., Lisetti, C.L., Tardif, R., Irish, L., & Gage, A. (2002). Emotion-based control of cooperating heterogeneous mobile robots. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, 18, 744-757.

Background

- Cox, M.T. (2005). Metacognition in computation: A selected research review. *Artificial Intelligence*, 169, 104-141.
- Ferrucci, D. et al. (2010). Building Watson: An overview of the DeepQA project. *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence*.
- Nikolic, D. (2016). AI-Kindergarten: What does it take to build a truly intelligent machine? Blog post, Institute for Ethics & Emerging Technologies.

Other resources

Clark, A. (1997). *Being There: Putting Brain, Body, and World Together Again*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Clark, A. (2014). *Mindware: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Cognitive Science*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Churchland, P. M. (1997). *Matter and Consciousness*, revised edition. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Fodor, J.A. (1998). *Concepts: Where Cognitive Science Went Wrong*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Frankish, K. and Ramsey, W. (Eds.) (2012). *The Cambridge Handbook of Cognitive Science*. Cambridge University Press.

Frankish, K. and Ramsey, W. (Eds.) (2014). *The Cambridge Handbook of Artificial Intelligence*. Cambridge University Press.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Academic integrity is a legitimate concern for every member of the campus community; all share in upholding the fundamental values of honesty, trust, respect, fairness, responsibility and professionalism. By choosing to join the UNLV community, students accept the expectations of the Student Academic Misconduct Policy and are encouraged when faced with choices to always take the ethical path. Students enrolling in UNLV assume the obligation to conduct themselves in a manner compatible with UNLV's function as an educational institution.

An example of academic misconduct is plagiarism. Plagiarism is using the words or ideas of another, from the Internet or any source, without proper citation of the sources. See the *Student Academic Misconduct Policy* (approved December 9, 2005) located at: <https://www.unlv.edu/studentconduct/student-conduct>.

COPYRIGHT

The University requires all members of the University Community to familiarize themselves **with** and to follow copyright and fair use requirements. **You are individually and solely responsible for violations of copyright and fair use laws. The university will neither protect nor defend you nor assume any responsibility for employee or student violations of fair use laws.** Violations of copyright laws could subject you to federal and state civil penalties and criminal liability, as well as disciplinary action under University policies. Additional information can be found at: <http://www.unlv.edu/provost/copyright>

DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER (DRC)

The UNLV Disability Resource Center (SSC-A 143, <http://drc.unlv.edu/>, 702-895-0866) provides resources for students with disabilities. If you feel that you have a disability, please make an appointment with a Disabilities Specialist at the DRC to discuss what options may be available to you. If you are registered with the UNLV Disability Resource Center, bring your Academic Accommodation Plan from the DRC to the instructor during office hours so that you may work together to develop strategies for implementing the accommodations to meet both your needs and the requirements of the course. Any information you provide is private and will be treated as such. To maintain the confidentiality of your request, please do not approach the instructor in front of others to discuss your accommodation needs.

RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS POLICY

Any student missing class quizzes, examinations, or any other class or lab work because of observance of religious holidays shall be given an opportunity during that semester to make up missed work. The make-up will apply to the religious holiday absence only. It shall be the responsibility of the student to notify the instructor **within the first 14 calendar days of the course for fall and spring courses (excepting modular courses), or within the first 7 calendar days of the course for summer and modular courses**, of his or her intention to participate in religious holidays which do not fall on state

holidays or periods of class recess. For additional information, please visit:
<http://catalog.unlv.edu/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=531>. **8**

TRANSPARENCY in LEARNING and TEACHING

The University encourages application of the transparency method of constructing assignments for student success. Please see these two links for further information:

<https://www.unlv.edu/provost/teachingandlearning>

<https://www.unlv.edu/provost/transparency>

INCOMPLETE GRADES

The grade of I – Incomplete – can be granted when a student has satisfactorily completed three-fourths of course work for that semester/session but for reason(s) beyond the student's control, and acceptable to the instructor, cannot complete the last part of the course, and the instructor believes that the student can finish the course without repeating it. The incomplete work must be made up before the end of the following regular semester. If course requirements are not completed within the time indicated, a grade of F will be recorded and the GPA will be adjusted accordingly. Students who are fulfilling an Incomplete do not register for the course but make individual arrangements with the instructor who assigned the I grade.

TUTORING and Coaching

The Academic Success Center (ASC) provides tutoring, academic success coaching and other academic assistance for all UNLV undergraduate students. For information regarding tutoring subjects, tutoring times, and other ASC programs and services, visit <http://www.unlv.edu/asc> or call 702-895-3177. The ASC building is located across from the Student Services Complex (SSC). Academic success coaching is located on the second floor of the SSC (ASC Coaching Spot). Drop-in tutoring is located on the second floor of the Lied Library and College of Engineering TEB second floor.

UNLV WRITING CENTER

One-on-one or small group assistance with writing is available free of charge to UNLV students at the Writing Center, located in CDC-3-301. Although walk-in consultations are sometimes available, students with appointments will receive priority assistance. Appointments may be made in person or by calling 702-895-3908. The student's Rebel ID Card, a copy of the assignment (if possible), and two copies of any writing to be reviewed are requested for the consultation. More information can be found at: <http://writingcenter.unlv.edu/>

REBELMAIL

By policy, faculty and staff should e-mail students' Rebelmail accounts only. Rebelmail is UNLV's official e-mail system for students. It is one of the primary ways students receive official university communication such as information about deadlines, major campus events, and announcements. All UNLV students receive a Rebelmail account after they have been admitted to the university. Students' e-mail prefixes are listed on class rosters. The suffix is always @unlv.nevada.edu. Emailing within WebCampus is acceptable.

FINAL EXAMINATIONS

The University requires that final exams given at the end of a course occur at the time and on the day specified in the final exam schedule. See the schedule at: <http://www.unlv.edu/registrar/calendars>. **9**

LIBRARY STATEMENT

Students may consult with a librarian on research needs. For this class, the Subject Librarian is (https://www.library.unlv.edu/contact/librarians_by_subject). UNLV Libraries provides resources to support students' access to information. Discovery, access, and use of information are vital skills for academic work and for successful post-college life. Access library resources and ask questions at <https://www.library.unlv.edu/>