

KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
The City University of New York

CURRICULUM TRANSMITTAL COVER PAGE

Department: History, Philosophy, and Political Science

Date: March 14, 2018

Title Of Course Or Degree: PHI 6600: Criminal Justice Ethics

Change(s) Initiated: (Please check)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Closing of Degree | <input type="checkbox"/> Change in Degree or Certificate Requirements |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Closing of Certificate | <input type="checkbox"/> Change in Degree Requirements (adding concentration) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New Certificate Proposal | <input type="checkbox"/> Change in Pre/Co-Requisite |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New Degree Proposal | <input type="checkbox"/> Change in Course Designation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Course | <input type="checkbox"/> Change in Course Description |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New 82 Course | <input type="checkbox"/> Change in Course Title, Numbers Credit and/or Hour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deletion of Course | <input type="checkbox"/> Change in Academic Policy |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pathways Submission: |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Life and Physical Science |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Math and Quantitative Reasoning |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> A. World Cultures and Global Issues |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> B. U.S. Experience in its Diversity |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> C. Creative Expression |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D. Individual and Society |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> E. Scientific World |

Other (please describe): _____

PLEASE ATTACH MATERIAL TO ILLUSTRATE AND EXPLAIN ALL CHANGES

DEPARTMENTAL ACTION

Action by Department and/or Departmental Committee, if required:

Date Approved: 3/14/2018 Signature, Committee Chairperson: Ma Bar

I have reviewed the attached material/proposal

Signature, Department Chairperson: Michael Bar

**KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

NEW COURSE PROPOSAL FORM

1. DEPARTMENT, COURSE NUMBER, AND TITLE (SPEAK TO ACADEMIC SCHEDULING FOR NEW COURSE NUMBER ASSIGNMENT):

History, Philosophy, and Political Science
PHI 6600
Criminal Justice Ethics

2. DOES THIS COURSE MEET A GENERAL EDUCATION/CUNY CORE CATEGORY?

- Life and Physical Science
- Math and Quantitative Reasoning
- A. World Cultures and Global Issues
- B. U.S. Experience in its Diversity
- C. Creative Expression
- D. Individual and Society
- E. Scientific World

IF YES, COMPLETE AND SUBMIT WITH THIS PROPOSAL A CUNY COMMON CORE SUBMISSION FORM.

3. DESCRIBE HOW THIS COURSE TRANSFERS (REQUIRED FOR A.S. DEGREE COURSE). IF A.A.S. DEGREE COURSE AND DOES NOT TRANSFER, JUSTIFY ROLE OF COURSE, E.G. DESCRIBE OTHER LEARNING OBJECTIVES MET:

This course will transfer as an elective Philosophy course fulfilling a Pathways requirement for Flexible Common Core's area of Individual and Society. This course is an elective philosophy course in Applied Ethics or Professional Ethics and offered at many two and four year colleges and universities. It is similar in content to the following courses offered at CUNY schools:

John Jay College:

Philosophy of the Rule of Law: Theory and Practice (PHI 315)
Police Ethics (PHI 321),
Judicial and Correctional Ethics (PHI 322)

Brooklyn College:

Fundamentals of Professional Ethics (PHI 3310)

4. BULLETIN DESCRIPTION OF COURSE:

Application of ethical theories to moral issues arising in the American criminal justice system, such as civil disobedience, police corruption, whistle blowing, stop and frisk, prosecutor, plea bargaining, capital punishment, liability for unethical conduct, and the war on terror.

5. CREDITS AND HOURS* (PLEASE CHECK ONE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW BASED ON CREDITS):

1-credit:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 hour lecture
	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 hours lab/field/gym

2-credits:	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 hours lecture
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 hour lecture, 2 hours lab/field
	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 hours lab/field

3-credits:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 hours lecture
	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 hours lecture, 2 hours lab/field

11. PROPOSED TEXT BOOK(S) AND/OR OTHER REQUIRED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL(S):

At the discretion of the individual instructor, any text or collection of texts that emphasizes primary material as well as secondary sources relating to moral theory and its application to problems arising in the criminal justice system.

Recommended Texts:

John Kleinig, *Ethics and Criminal Justice: An Introduction*, (Cambridge University Press, 2008, ISBN: 978-0521682831)

Michael Brasswell, Larry Miller, and Joycelyn Pollock, *Case Studies in Criminal Justice Ethics (2nd Edition)*, (Waveland press, Inc., 2011, ISBN 978-1577667476)

Jay S. Albanes, *A Professional Ethics in Criminal Justice: Being Ethical When No One is Looking (3rd Edition)*, (Pearson, 2011, ISBN 978-0131375659)

Cyndi Banks, *Criminal Justice Ethics: Theory and Practices (third edition)*, (SAGE Publications, Inc, 2012, ISBN 978-1412995450)

Joycelyn M. Pollock, *Ethical Dilemmas and Decisions in Criminal Justice (eighth edition)*, (Cengage Learning, 2013, ISBN 978-1285062662)

12. REQUIRED COURSE FOR MAJOR OR AREA OF CONCENTRATION? NO

IF YES, COURSE IS REQUIRED, SUBMIT A SEPARATE CURRICULUM TRANSMITTAL COVER PAGE INDICATING A "CHANGE IN DEGREE OR CERTIFICATE REQUIREMENTS" AS WELL AS A PROPOSAL THAT MUST INCLUDE A RATIONALE AND THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL PAGES: A "**CURRENT**" DEGREE WITH ALL PROPOSED DELETIONS (STRIKEOUTS) AND ADDITIONS (BOLDED TEXT) CLEARLY INDICATED, AND A "PROPOSED" DEGREE, WHICH DISPLAYS THE DEGREE AS IT WILL APPEAR IN THE CATALOG (FOR A COPY OF THE MOST UP-TO-DATE DEGREE/CERTIFICATE REQUIREMENTS CONTACT AMANDA KALIN, EXT. 4611).

NYSED GUIDELINES OF 45 CREDITS OF LIBERAL ARTS COURSE WORK FOR AN ASSOCIATE OF ARTS DEGREE (A.A.), 30 CREDITS FOR AN ASSOCIATE OF SCIENCE DEGREE (A.S.), AND 20 CREDITS FOR AN APPLIED ASSOCIATE OF SCIENCE DEGREE (A.A.S.) MUST BE ADHERED TO FOR ALL 60 CREDIT PROGRAMS.

13. IF OPEN ONLY TO SELECTED STUDENTS SPECIFY POPULATION: NO**14. EXPLAIN WHAT STUDENTS WILL KNOW AND BE ABLE TO DO UPON COMPLETION OF COURSE:**

The student will be able to make decisions as a criminal justice professional giving appropriate consideration to the moral dimension. The student will be able to rationally justify personal decisions not only on the basis of a professional code of ethics, but also based on some wider ranging humanitarian view. The student will not only make better decisions; but also be able to explain his/her rationale for difficult personal decisions made as a criminal justice professional

Philosophy is both critical and conceptual. It focuses not only on what someone thinks but most importantly on the reasons that support those views. In terms of CUNY Pathways requirements, this course falls under "Individual and Society." We will be examining those theories that purport to explain and justify the ethical judgments and moral values that balance individual choice over and against claims of justice for society and the government and the application of these theories to moral issues that arise in the American criminal justice system.

Students should be able to:

- Gather, interpret, and assess information from a variety of sources and points of view

- Construct critical arguments, provide evidence, and examine underlying premises
- Show understanding of theories exploring the nature of ethical reasoning
- Demonstrate critical perspective on ethical debates over the scope of individual choice and the claims of justice for society and the government
- Write clearly and critically.

15. METHODS OF TEACHING –E.G. LECTURES, LABORATORIES, AND OTHER ASSIGNMENTS FOR STUDENTS, INCLUDING ANY OF THE FOLLOWING: DEMONSTRATIONS, GROUP WORK, WEBSITE OR E-MAIL INTERACTIONS AND/OR ASSIGNMENTS, PRACTICE IN APPLICATION OF SKILLS, ETC.:

Lecture based on the assigned reading, using the Socratic method to engage the student. To engage each individual student, the lectures will be augmented with

- In-class writing assignments (low-stakes),
- Group study and presentation of relevant cases to the class,
- Online video content (as available),
- Blackboard quizzes, tests, and discussion forums will be used to engage each individual student.

16. ASSIGNMENTS TO STUDENTS:

Reading assignments will be combined with low stakes and high stakes writing assignments. These may include:

- summaries of readings
- outlines of the arguments presented
- Assessments such as
 - “One Minute Summaries”
 - Identification of the “Muddiest Point,” and
 - “Knowledge Mapping” will be used where appropriate
- Periodic participation in online discussion forums related to case studies

17. DESCRIBE METHOD OF EVALUATING LEARNING SPECIFIED IN #15 - INCLUDE PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN FOR GRADING. IF A DEVELOPMENTAL COURSE INCLUDE HOW THE NEXT LEVEL COURSE IS DETERMINED AS WELL AS NEXT LEVEL PLACEMENT.

Class attendance and participation in discussion is emphasized, as it is in all Philosophy courses. During the course of the semester scaffolded assignments, in-class discussions and panel debates will aid the student in developing the necessary skills of argument analysis and the application of theories of Moral Philosophy to the solution of criminal justice problems. The assignments will include informal writing assignment (in-class and on Blackboard Discussion Boards). The in class discussion and activities will provide additional opportunity to refine the skill of rationally presenting and defending positions on controversial ethical issues. The following are sample topics for these assignments:

- What is the fundamental principle of morality according to Utilitarianism?
- Is “stop and frisk” permissible according to Kant’s Categorical Imperative?
- Is the primary function of correctional institutions retributive or rehabilitative according to Utilitarianism?
- State and explain the Kantian argument against justifying incarceration on the basis of its value as a deterrent.

There will be two exams, a Midterm and Final, each will have an objective component consisting of multiple choice and short answer questions and an essay component. The objective tests will test the student’s mastery of the ethical theories which provide the basis for solutions to the ethical questions that will be addressed during the course of the semester. For example, they will give the student the opportunity to

demonstrate his/her understanding of Utilitarianism and Deontology and the analysis of arguments provided by supporters of these theories in support of their positions on issues of individual choice and the requirement of morality in policing, the courts, and the correctional system..

The student will be required to submit 2 Midterm Essays and 2 Final Essays. The essays will be from two to five pages long and submitted online to Blackboard. A sample topics for such an essays is:

- Select two articles (approved by the instructor) on the “stop and frisk” policing policy. One should defend the policy and the other should argue against the policy. Explain the moral issue concerning this policing policy. For each article state and explain the argument advanced concerning the morality of the policy, explain the moral theory that is invoked in support of the argument. Evaluate the two arguments and defend your conclusion based on your evaluation of the argument.

Each essay will require the student to provide a clearly written critical analysis of arguments provided on each side of an ethical dilemma related to criminal justice cases. The essays will require the student to defend a position on these issues showing his/her mastery of ethical reasoning as it applies to the relevant ethical debates. The student will research and read at least two instructor-approved articles from a source other than the text for the at least one of the final essays.

Grades will be determined on the basis of the following factors:

- (10%) Assignments (in class and take home)
- (10%) Class Participation & Group Assignments
- (20%) Mid-Term Exam
- (20%) Mid-Term Essays
- (20%) Final Exam
- (20%) Final Essays

18. TOPICAL COURSE OUTLINE FOR THE 12 WEEK SEMESTER (WHICH SHOULD BE SPECIFIC REGARDING TOPICS COVERED, LEARNING ACTIVITIES, AND ASSIGNMENTS):

1. Ethics and Critical Thinking

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. *To develop the ability to understand the essence of good character.*
- ii. *To distinguish between morals, values, and ethics.*
- iii. *To recognize the concept of moral relativism.*
- iv. *To understand the importance of critical thinking to ethics.*
- v. *To increase awareness of the connection between etiquette and ethics.*

2. Virtue Ethics

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. *To understand the centrality of moral virtue to understanding the ethics of Aristotle.*
- ii. *To appreciate the hierarchy of goods and the difference between real and apparent goods.*
- iii. *To recognize the distinctions among virtue ethics, stoicism, and hedonism.*
- iv. *To increase understanding of the linkage between the moral virtues in pursuing real goods.*
- v. *To develop skills in applying moral virtues and real goods in evaluating ethical dilemmas.*

3. Formalism: Carrying Out Obligation and Duty*Student Learning Objectives:*

- i. *To understand the nature of deontological ethics.*
- ii. *To recognize the centrality of duties versus inclinations in Kantian ethics.*
- iii. *To increase the ability to isolate the categorical imperative from any set of facts presented in an ethical dilemma.*
- iv. *To distinguish the categorical imperative from the practical imperative and hypothetical imperatives.*
- v. *To understand why lying is never permitted using the ethics of formalism.*

4. Utilitarianism: Measuring*Student Learning Objectives:*

- i. *To understand the nature of teleological ethics and its differences from deontological ethics.*
- ii. *To recognize the centrality of the principle of utility in the ethics of John Stuart Mill.*
- iii. *To develop an appreciation of why utilitarianism is sometimes called consequentialism.*
- iv. *To increase the ability to distinguish objective ways to assess the total happiness produced by an action.*
- v. *To appreciate criticisms of utilitarianism as a way to judge ethical action.*

5. Crime and Law: Which Behaviors Ought to Be Crimes?*Student Learning Objectives:*

- i. *To understand the differences between the consensus view and conflict view of criminal law.*
- ii. *To appreciate the ethical issues posed by "quality of life" offenses.*
- iii. *To distinguish the major perspectives on crime causation: classical, positivism, structural, and ethical.*
- iv. *To develop an appreciation for the linkage between Kohlberg's theory of moral development and ethics.*
- v. *To increase understanding of Gilligan's ethics of caring.*

6. Police: How Should the Law Be Enforced?*Student Learning Objectives:*

- i. *To understand how the Fourth and Fifth Amendments of the Bill of Rights provide the principles for police stops, searches, arrests, and interrogations.*
- ii. *To appreciate the threshold of "stop and frisk" and its differences from probable cause in evaluating situations for police.*
- iii. *To recognize the differences among nonfeasance, misfeasance, and malfeasance in assessing police decisions.*
- iv. *To develop an appreciation for the different causes and circumstances of police corruption.*
- v. *To evaluate the relationship between codes of ethics and ethical principles in producing consistent conduct.*

7. Courts: How Ought a Case Be Adjudicated?*Student Learning Objectives:*

- i. *To appreciate John Rawls' theory of justice and the "greatest equal liberty" principle.*

- ii. *To recognize the importance of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct for prosecution and defense conduct.*
- iii. *To understand what a "mob lawyer" is and the proper role of a defense attorney in criminal cases.*
- iv. *To assess the scope of a prosecutor's discretion and its implication for ethical conduct.*
- v. *To evaluate the nature of plea bargaining and the ethical dilemma it creates.*
- vi. *To understand the ethical underpinnings of sentencing decisions.*

8. Punishment and Corrections: What Should Be Done with Offenders?

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. *To understand the distinctions among the four purposes of criminal sanctions: retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, and rehabilitation.*
- ii. *To recognize the issue of disparity in sentencing, how sentencing guidelines were designed to reduce disparity, and the ethical issues involved.*
- iii. *To assess the issue of correctional ethics and the situations in which ethical decisions become crucial in correctional settings.*
- iv. *To understand how corporal punishment and innovative sentences can be evaluated from an ethical perspective.*
- v. *To distinguish the issue of punishment under the Eighth Amendment, and how capital punishment and life in prison can be evaluated using ethical principles.*

9. Liability: What Should Be the Consequence of Unethical Conduct?

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. *To understand the nature of civil remedies for ethical misconduct, such as compensation and blacklisting.*
- ii. *To recognize the double standards often placed on public officials regarding liability for conduct that is accepted when acting as private citizens.*
- iii. *To evaluate the ethical dilemmas posed by sex offender notifications laws.*
- iv. *To distinguish "right versus right" ethical dilemmas.*
- v. *To assess the liabilities faced in unethical individual, corporate, and government misconduct.*

10. The Future: Will We Be More or Less Ethical?

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. *To evaluate the ethical dilemma in the case of the Unabomber.*
- ii. *To appreciate the reason behind the establishment of the CDC panel of ethicists.*
- iii. *To understand the ethical distinctions between killing and letting die in a medical context.*

11. Contemporary Moral Issues in Criminal Justice

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. *To understand the issue of racial discrimination in criminal justice*
- ii. *To define terrorism and discriminate between warfare and crime control.*

12. Summary and Conclusions

19. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCE MATERIALS:**Ethics & Justice**

- Michael S. Josephson and Wes Hanson, Eds., *The Power of Character* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998)
- Jeffrey Reiman, "Criminal Justice Ethics," in P. Leighton and J. Reiman, Eds., *Criminal Justice Ethics* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2001)
- Mortimer Adler, *Desires Right and Wrong: The Ethics of Enough* (New York: Macmillan, 1991)
- Plato, *Last Days of Socrates, The Euthyphro; The Apology; Crito; Phaedo* (New York: Penguin Classics, 1993)
- Plato, *The Republic* (ca. 370 B.C.) (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994)
- Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics* (330 B.C.E.) (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- Immanuel Kant, *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785) (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1993)
- Vincent Barry, *The Dog Ate My Homework: Personal Responsibility—How We Avoid It and What to Do about It* (New York: Andrews McMeel, 1998)
- Sissela Bok, *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life* (New York: Vintage Books, 1999).
- Rhea R. Borja, "Girl, Mother Do \$150 Good Deed," *Richmond Times-Dispatch* (August 31, 2000)
- Elaine Aradillas, "Don't Shoot!: I'm Just a Cop Breaking into Your Home," *The Orlando Sentinel* (May 19, 2007).
- Ben Jones and Emily Bazar, "Faith, Medicine at Odds in Chemo Refusal," *USA Today* (May 21, 2009)
- John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism* (1863) (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1993), p. 16.
- Jeremy Bentham, *The Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1822) (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1988)
- Cesare Beccaria, *An Essay on Crimes and Punishments* (1764) (Indianapolis, IN: Branden Publishing, 1992)
- Arrington, Robert. 1983. "A Defense of Ethical Relativism." *Metaphilosophy* 14: 225–239.
- BBC. 2010, June 15. "The Islamic Veil Across Europe." Retrieved August 10, 2010 (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/5414098.stm>).
- Bell, Dan. 2006. "Netherlands Moves Toward Total Ban on Muslim Veils." *The Guardian*, November 11. Retrieved April 23, 2007 (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/religion/Story/0,,1945461,001.html>).
- Bunting, Harry. 1996. "A Single True Morality? The Challenge of Relativism." Pp. 73–85 in *Philosophy and Pluralism*, edited by David Archard. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Clements, Joan. 2006. "Holland to Ban Burqa as 'Terror Threat.'" *The Telegraph*, November 18. CNN. 2003, December 17.
- "Chirac: Ban Headscarves in Schools." Retrieved March 23, 2007 (<http://www.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/europe/12/17/france.headscarves/index.html>).
- Cook, John. 1999. *Morality and Cultural Differences*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Death Penalty Information Center. 2007. "Ohio Inmate Becomes the 119th Innocent Person Freed From Death Row." Washington, DC: Death Penalty Information Center. Retrieved April 7, 2007 (<http://truthinjustice.org/jamison.htm>).

- Felkenes, George. 1987. "Ethics in the Graduate Criminal Justice Curriculum." *Teaching Philosophy* 10 (1): 23–26.
- Readings in Moral Philosophy (2nd ed.), edited by James Rachels. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Grice, Andrew. 2006. "Blair: 'Veils Are Mark of Separation and Make Other comfortable.'" *The Independent*, October 18. Retrieved November 5, 2011 (<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/blair-veils-are-mark-of-separation-and-make-others-uncomfortable-420538.html>)
- Hare, Richard M. 1987. "Moral Conflicts." Pp. 205–238 in *Moral Dilemmas*, edited by Christopher Gowans. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hinman, Lawrence. 1998. *Ethics: A Pluralistic Approach to Moral Theory*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Holmes, Robert. 1998. *Basic Moral Philosophy* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Human Rights Watch. 1998. "New Orleans: Recent History." New York: Human Rights Watch. Retrieved March 1, 2008 (<http://www.hrw.org/reports98/police/uspo93.htm>).
- Kane, Robert. 1996. *Through the Moral Maze: Searching for Absolute Values in a Pluralistic World*. Armonk, NY: North Castle Books.
- Ladd, John. 1973. *Ethical Relativism*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rachels, James. 1991. "Subjectivism." Pp. 432–441 in *A Companion to Ethics*, edited by Peter Singer. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Press.
- Singer, Peter. 1995. *How Are We to Live? Ethics in an Age of Self-Interest*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

PUNISHMENT:

- Ackerman, Bruce A., 1980, *Social Justice in the Liberal State*, New Haven: Yale University Press
- Allen, Francis A., 1981, *The Decline of the Rehabilitative Ideal*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Barry, Brian, 1989, *Theories of Justice*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Beccaria, Cesare, 1764, *On Crimes and Punishments*, tr. David Young, Indianapolis: Hackett, 1986.
- Bedau, H. A., 2001, "Feinberg's Liberal Theory of Punishment," *Buffalo Criminal Law Review*, 5: 103–44.
- —, 1991, "Punitive Violence and Its Alternatives," in James B. Brady and Newton Garver (eds.), *Justice, Law, and Violence*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 193–209.
- —, 1983, "Bentham's Utilitarian Critique of the Death Penalty," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 74: 1033–65
- —, 1978, "Retribution and the Theory of Punishment," *Journal of Philosophy*, 75: 601–20.
- —, 1972, "Penal Theory and Prison Reality Today," *Juris Doctor*, 2: 40–43.
- —, Bentham, Jeremy, 1789. *The Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Laurence J. LaFleur (Intro.), New York: Hafner Publishing, 1948.
- Butler, Joseph, 1723, "Sermon Upon Resentment", in Butler, *Works* (Volume 2), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850, pp. 87–98.
- Card, Claudia, 1973, "Retributive Penal Liability," *American Philosophical Quarterly Monographs*, 7: 17–35;
- Currie, Elliot, 1985, *Confronting Crime: An American Challenge*, New York: Pantheon.
- Davis, Angela Y., 2003, *Are Prisons Obsolete?*, New York: Seven Stories Press.

- Davis, Michael, 1992, *To Make the Punishment Fit the Crime: Essays in the Theory of Criminal Justice*, Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 42–68.
- Duff, R. A., 1986, *Trials and Punishments*, Cambridge University Press.
- —, 2007, *Answering for Crime: Responsibility and Liability in the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Hart Publishing
- Dworkin, Ronald, 1986, *Law's Empire*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Feinberg, Joel, 1965, "The Expressive Function of Punishment," *The Monist*, 49: 397–423;
- Fingarette, Herbert, 1978, "Punishment and Suffering," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Association*, 50: 499–525.
- Foucault, Michel, 1977, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, New York: Pantheon.
- Garland, David, 1990, *Punishment and Modern Society*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- —, 2001, *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gibbs, Jack P., 1975, *Crime, Punishment, and Deterrence*, New York: Elsevier.
- Goldman, Alan, 1982, "Toward a New Theory of Punishment," *Law and Philosophy*, 1: 57–76;
- Gross, Hyman, 1979, *A Theory of Criminal Justice*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hampton, Jean, 1984, "The Moral Education Theory of Punishment," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 13: 208–38;
- Harding, Christopher, 1989, and Richard W. Ireland, *Punishment: Rhetoric, Rule, and Practice*, London: Routledge.
- Hart, Jr., Henry M., 1958, "The Aims of the Criminal Law," *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 23: 401–41.
- Hart, Herbert L. A., 1968, *Punishment and Responsibility: Essays in the Philosophy of Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Henberg, Marvin, 1990, *Retribution: Evil for Evil in Ethics, Law, and Literature*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hoekema, David, 1986, *Rights and Wrongs: Coercion, Punishment, and the State*, Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press.
- Honderich, Ted, 1976, *Punishment: The Supposed Justifications*, rev. ed., Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Kelly, Erin I., 2009, "Criminal Justice without Retribution," *Journal of Philosophy*, 106: 440–462.
- Lacey, Nicola, 1988, *State Punishment: Political Principles and Community Values*, London: Routledge.
- Maestro, Marcello, 1973, *Cesare Beccaria and the Origin of Penal Reform*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Martinson, Robert, 1974, "What Works? — Questions and Answers About Prison Reform," *The Public Interest*, 10: 22–54.
- Moore, Kathleen Dean, 1989, *Pardons: Justice, Mercy, and the Public Interest*, New York: Oxford University Press
- Moore, Michael S., 1987, "The Moral Worth of Retribution," in Ferdinand Schoeman (ed.), *Responsibility, Character, and the Emotions: New Essays in Moral Psychology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, Herbert, 1968, "Persons and Punishment," *The Monist*, 52: 475–501.
- Murphy Jeffrie G., 1973, "Marxism and Retribution," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 2: 217–43.

- —, 2003, *Getting Even: Forgiveness and Its Limits*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, 1887, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, tr. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Vintage, 1969.
- Nozick, Robert, 1981, *Philosophical Explanations*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 366–74.
- Pincoffs, Edmund, 1977, “Are Questions of Desert Decidable?” in J. B. Cederblom and William Blizek (eds.), *Justice and Punishment*, Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, pp. 75–88.
- Primoratz, Igor, 1989, *Justifying Legal Punishment*, Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- Quinn, Warren, 1985, “The Right to Threaten and the Right to Punish,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 14: 327–373.
- Rawls, John, 1955, “Two Concepts of Rules,” *Philosophical Review*, 64: 3–32.
- —, 1971, *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971
- Reiman, Jeffrey, 1990, *Justice and Modern Moral Philosophy*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Richards, David A. J., 1977, *The Moral Criticism of Law*, Encino, CA: Dickenson.
- Scanlon, T. M., 1998, *What We Owe To Each Other*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- —, 1999, “Punishment and the Rule of Law”; reprinted in Scanlon, *The Difficulty of Tolerance: Essays in Political Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Semple, Janet, 1993, *Bentham's Prison. A Study of the Panopticon Penitentiary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Shelby, Tommie, 2007, “Justice, Deviance, and the Dark Ghetto,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 35: 126–160.
- Singer, Richard G., *Just Deserts: Sentencing Based on Equality and Desert*, Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1979.
- Skinner, B. F., 1948, *Walden Two*, New York: Macmillan.

CRIMINAL LAW

- Alexander, L., and K.K. Ferzan (with S. Morse), 2009, *Crime and Culpability: A Theory of Criminal Law*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Altman, A., and C.H. Wellman, 2004, “A Defense of International Criminal Law”, *Ethics*, 115: 35–67.
- Ashworth, A. J., 2000, “Is the Criminal Law a Lost Cause? ”, *Law Quarterly Review*, 116: 225–56.
- —, 2009, *Principles of Criminal Law*, 6th edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ashworth, A. J., and M. Blake, 1996, “The Presumption of Innocence in English Criminal Law”, *Criminal Law Review*, May: 306–317.
- Ashworth, A. J., and M. Redmayne, 2010, *The Criminal Process*, 4th edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ashworth, A. J., and L. Zedner, 2010, “Preventive Orders: A Problem of Under-Criminalization?”, in R.A. Duff, et al. (eds.), *The Boundaries of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 59–87.
- —, 2011, “Just Prevention: Preventive Rationales and the Limits of the Criminal Law”, in Duff and Green (eds.) 2011a, 279–303.
- —, 2012, “Prevention and Criminalization: Justifications and Limits”, *New Criminal Law Review*, 15: 542–71.
- Ashworth, A. J., with L. Zedner and P. Tomlin, 2013, *Prevention and the Limits of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Baker, D. J., 2011, *The Right Not to be Criminalized*, Farnham: Ashgate.
- Becker, L., 1974, "Criminal Attempts and the Theory of the Law of Crimes", *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 3: 262–94.
- Bianchi, H., 1994, *Justice as Sanctuary: Toward a New System of Crime Control*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Blackstone, W., 1765–9, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 4 volumes, Oxford: Clarendon Press. [[available online](#)].
- *Boston University Law Review*, 1996, "Symposium: The Intersection of Tort and Criminal Law", Volume 76: 1–373.
- Braithwaite, J. and P. Pettit, 1990, *Not Just Deserts*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, D., 2009, "History's Challenge to Criminal Law Theory", *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 3: 271–87.
- Burns, R. P., 1999, *A Theory of the Trial*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cassese, A., 2008, *International Criminal Law*, 2nd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Christie, N., 1977, "Conflicts as Property", *British Journal of Criminology*, 17: 1–15.
- Cotterrell, R., 1995, *Law's Community*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dagger, R., 1993, "Playing Fair with Punishment", *Ethics*, 103: 473–88.
- —, 2008, "Republican Punishment, Consequentialist or Retributive?", in C. Laborde & J. Maynor (eds.), *Republicanism and Political Theory*, Indianapolis: Wiley, 219–45.
- —, 2011, "Republicanism and the Foundations of Criminal Law", in Duff and Green (eds.) 2011a, 44–66.
- Dan-Cohen, M., 1984, "Decision Rules and Conduct Rules: On Acoustic Separation in Criminal Law", *Harvard Law Review*, 97: 625–77.
- Dan-Cohen, M., 2002, "Defending Dignity", in M. Dan-Cohen, *Harmful Thoughts: Essays on Law, Self and Morality*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 150–171.
- Dempsey, M. M., 2009, *Prosecuting Domestic Violence*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Devlin, P., 1965, *The Enforcement of Morals*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dimock, S., 1997, "Retributivism and Trust", *Law and Philosophy*, 16: 37–62.
- —, forthcoming, "Contractarian Criminal Law Theory and Mala Prohibita Offenses", in R.A. Duff, et al. (eds.), *Criminalization: The Aims and Limits of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dolinko, D., 1991, "Some Thoughts about Retributivism", *Ethics*, 101: 537–59.
- Dressler, J., 2012, *Understanding Criminal Law*, 6th edition, New York: LexisNexis
- Dubber, M. D., 2001, "Policing Possession: The War on Crime and the End of Criminal Law", *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 91: 829–996.
- Dubber, M. D., 2005, *The Police Power: Patriarchy and the Foundations of American Government*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Duff, R. A., 1986, *Trials and Punishments*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- —, 2001, *Punishment, Communication, and Community*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- —, 2005, "Theorizing Criminal Law", *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 25: 353–67.
- —, 2007, *Answering for Crime: Responsibility and Liability in the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- —, forthcoming, "Theorizing Criminal Law", *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 8.
- Duff, R. A., with L. Farmer, S. Marshall, and V. Tadros, 2007, *The Trial on Trial (3): Towards a Normative Theory of the Criminal Trial*, Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Duff R. A., and S. P. Green (eds.), 2011a, *Philosophical Foundations of Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Duff, R. A., and S. P. Green, 2011b, “ Introduction: Searching for Foundations” , in Duff and Green (eds.) 2011a, 1–18.
- Dworkin, G. (ed.), 1994, *Morality, Harm and the Law*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Dzur, A. W., 2012, *Punishment, Participatory Democracy, and the Jury*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Farmer, L., 1996, *Criminal Law, Tradition and Legal Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- —, 2010, “ Criminal Wrongs in Historical Perspective” , in R.A. Duff, et al. (eds.), *The Boundaries of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 214–37.
- —, forthcoming, “ Criminal Law as an Institution: Rethinking Theoretical Approaches to Criminalization”, in R.A. Duff, et al. (eds.), *Criminalization: The Aims and Limits of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feinberg, J., 1984, *Harm to Others*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- —, 1985, *Offense to Others*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- —, 1986, *Harm to Self*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- —, 1988, *Harmless Wrongdoing*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fletcher, G., 1978, *Rethinking Criminal Law*, Boston: Little, Brown.
- Gardner, J., 1998, “Crime: In Proportion and in Perspective”, in A. J. Ashworth & M. Wasik (eds.), *Fundamentals of Sentencing Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 31–52.
- —, 2007, *Offences and Defences*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Glazebrook, P. R., 1978, “Situational Liability”, in Glazebrook (ed.), *Reshaping the Criminal Law*, London: Stevens, 108–19.
- Goldberg, J., and B. Zipursky, 2010, “ Torts as Wrongs”, *Texas Law Review*, 88: 917–86.
- Green, S. P., 1997, “Why it's a Crime to Tear the Tag off a Mattress: Over-Criminalization and the Moral Content of Regulatory Offenses”, *Emory Law Journal*, 46: 1533–1615.
- —, 2005, *Lying, Cheating, and Stealing: A Moral Theory of White-Collar Crime*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- —, 2012, *Thirteen Ways to Steal a Bicycle: Theft Law in the Information Age*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Harcourt, B.E., 1999, “The Collapse of the Harm Principle”, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 90: 109–92.
- Hart, H. L. A., 1968, *Punishment and Responsibility*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- —, 1994, *The Concept of Law*, 2nd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hirst, M., 2003, *Jurisdiction and the Ambit of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holtug, N., 2002, “The Harm Principle”, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 5: 357–89.
- Horder, J., forthcoming, “Bureaucratic ‘Criminal’ Law: Too Much of a Bad Thing?”, in R.A. Duff, et al. (eds.), *Criminalization: The Aims and Limits of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. .
- Hughes, G., 1958, “Criminal Omissions”, *Yale Law Journal*, 67: 590–637.
- Hulsman, L., 1986, “Critical Criminology and the Concept of Crime”, *Contemporary Crises*, 10: 63–80.
- Husak, D., 1987, *Philosophy of Criminal Law*, Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.
- —, 1995, “The Nature and Justifiability of Nonconsummate Offenses”, *Arizona Law Review*, 37: 151–83.
- —, 1998, “Does Criminal Liability Require an Act?” in R. A. Duff (ed.), *Philosophy and the Criminal Law*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 60–100.

- —, 2004, “The Criminal Law as a Last Resort”, *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 24: 207–36.
- —, 2005, “Malum Prohibitum and Retributivism”, in R. A. Duff and S. P. Green (eds.) *Defining Crimes: Essays on the Special Part of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 65–90.
- —, 2007, *Overcriminalization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jareborg, N., 2005, “Criminalization as Last Resort (Ultima Ratio)”, *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 2: 521–34.
- Kelman, M., 1981, “Interpretive Construction in the Substantive Criminal Law”, *Stanford Law Review*, 33: 591–673.
- Kleinig, J., 1978, “Crime and the Concept of Harm”, *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 27: 32–42.
- Lacey, N., 2000, “‘Philosophical Foundations of the Common Law’: Social not Metaphysical”, in J. Horder (ed.), *Oxford Essays in Jurisprudence*, 4th Series, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 17–39.
- —, 2001, “In Search of the Responsible Subject: History, Philosophy and Criminal Law Theory”, *Modern Law Review*, 64: 350–71.
- —, 2009, “Historicising Criminalisation: Conceptual and Empirical Issues”, *Modern Law Review*, 72: 936–60.
- Lamond, G., 2007, “What is a Crime?”, *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 27: 609–32.
- Lippke, R., 2011, *The Ethics of Plea Bargaining*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Luban, D., 2004, “A Theory of Crimes Against Humanity”, *Yale Journal of International Law*, 29: 85–168.
- —, 2010, “Fairness to Rightness: Jurisdiction, Legality, and the Legitimacy of International Criminal Law”, in Besson, S., and Tasioulas, J. (eds), *Philosophy of International Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 569–88.
- Marshall, S. E., and R.A. Duff, 1998, “Criminalization and Sharing Wrongs”, *Canadian Journal of Law & Jurisprudence*, 11: 7–22.
- Matravers, M., 2011, “Political Theory and the Criminal Law”, in Duff and Green 2011a, 67–82.
- May, L., 2005, *Crimes Against Humanity*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mill, J. S., 1859, *On Liberty*, London: Parker.
- Moore, M. S., 1993, *Act and Crime*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- —, 1997, *Placing Blame: A Theory of Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- —, 2009, “A Tale of Two Theories”, *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 28: 27–48.
- Murphy, J. G., and J. Coleman, 1990, *The Philosophy of Law*, 2nd edition, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Norrie, A. W., 2001, *Crime, Reason and History*, 2nd edition, London: Butterworths.
- Persak, N., 2007, *Criminalising Harmful Conduct*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pettit, P., 1997, “Republican Theory and Criminal Punishment”, *Utilitas*, 9: 59–79.
- —, 2002, “Is Criminal Justice Politically Feasible?”, *Buffalo Criminal Law Review*, 5: 427–50.
- —, forthcoming, “Criminalization in Republican Theory”, in R.A. Duff, et al. (eds.), *Criminalization: The Aims and Limits of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Posner, R. A., 1985, “An Economic Theory of the Criminal Law”, *Columbia Law Review*, 85: 1193–1231.
- Ramsay, P., 2012, *The Insecurity State: Vulnerable Autonomy and the Right to Security in the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raz, J., 1986, *The Morality of Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- —, 1987, “Autonomy, Toleration, and the Harm Principle”, in R. Gavison (ed.), *Issues in Contemporary Legal Philosophy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 313–33.
- Renzo, M., 2013, “Responsibility and Answerability in International Criminal Law”, in R.A. Duff, et al. (eds.), *The Constitution of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 209–36.
- —, 2012, “Crimes Against Humanity and the Limits of International Criminal Law”, *Law and Philosophy*, 31: 443–76.
- Rescher, N., 1972, *Welfare: The Social Issue in Philosophical Perspective*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Ripstein, A., 1999, *Equality, Responsibility and the Law*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- —, 2006, “Beyond the Harm Principle”, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 34: 215–45.
- Robinson, P. H., 1997, *Structure and Function in Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roxin, C., 2006, *Strafrecht Allgemeiner Teil*, 4th edition, Volume 1, Munich: CH Beck.
- Schonsheck, J., 1994, *On Criminalization: An Essay in the Philosophy of the Criminal Law*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Simester, A. P. (ed.), 2005, *Appraising Strict Liability*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Simester, A. P., J.R. Spencer, G.R. Sullivan, and G.J. Virgo, 2010, *Simester and Sullivan's Criminal Law: Theory and Doctrine*, 4th edition, Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Simester, A. P., and A. von Hirsch, 2006, *Incivilities: Regulating Offensive Behaviour*, Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- —, 2011, *Crimes, Harms, and Wrongs: On the Principles of Criminalization*, Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Steiker, C., 1997, “Punishment and Procedure: Punishment Theory and the Criminal-Civil Procedural Divide”, *Georgetown Law Journal*, 85: 775–820.
- Stephen, J. F., 1873, *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, J. White (ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Stewart, H., 2010, “The Limits of the Harm Principle”, *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 4: 17–35.
- Stuntz, W., 2011, *The Collapse of American Criminal Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tadros, V., 2005, *Criminal Responsibility*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- —, 2010, “Criminalization and Regulation”, in R.A. Duff, et al. (eds.), *The Boundaries of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 163–90.
- Thorburn, M., 2011a, “Criminal Law as Public Law”, in Duff and Green (eds.) 2011a, 21–43.
- —, 2011b, “Constitutionalism and the Limits of the Criminal Law”, in R. A. Duff, et al. (eds.), *The Structures of the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 85–105.
- von Hirsch, A., with D. Garland, and A. Wakefield (eds.), 2000, *Ethical and Social Perspectives on Situational Crime Prevention*, Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Walker, N., 1980, *Punishment, Danger and Stigma*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weigend, T., 1988, “The Legal and Practical Problems Posed by the Difference between Criminal Law and Administrative Penal Law”, *Revue Internationale de Droit Pénal*, 59: 67–86.
- Wells, C., and O. Quick, 2010, *Lacey, Wells and Quick, Reconstructing Criminal Law: Text and Materials*, 4th edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, B., 1976, *Morality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wohlers, W., with A. von Hirsch, and R. Hefendehl (eds.), 2003, *Die Rechtsgutstheorie*, Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.

- Wolfenden, J., 1957, *Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution* (The Wolfenden Report) (Cmnd 247), London: HMSO.
- Yaffe, G., 2010, *Attempts in in the Philosophy of Action and the Criminal Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zipursky, B., 1998, "Rights, Wrongs, and Recourse in the Law of Torts", *Vanderbilt Law Review*, 51: 1-100

POLICING

- Alpert, L. (1982). "Exercising Discretion on the Bench," in B. Adams and M. Pogrebin, eds., *The Invisible Justice System*, pp. 93-103. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Ayres, R., and Ayres, M. (1981). "Police on Strike: What Triggers Their Walkouts," *F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 50(1), 13-16.
- Bennett, R., ed. (1983). *Police at Work: Policy Issues and Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Betz, J. (1982). "Moral Consideration Concerning the Police Response to Hostage-takers," in F. Elliston and N. Bowie eds., *Ethics, Public Policy, and Criminal Justice*, pp. 110-132. Cambridge: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain.
- Birch, J. (1983). "Reflections on Police Corruption," *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 2 (2), 183-85.
- Bok, S. (1978). *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life*. New York: Pantheon.
- Bond, K. (1978). "Confidentiality and Protection of Human Subjects," *American Sociologist*, 13, 149-152.
- Boness, F. & Cordes, J. (1971). "The Researcher-Subject Relationship: The Need for Protection and a Model Statute," *Georgetown Law Review*, 62, 243-272. J
- Brady, J. (1983). "The Justifiability of Hollow-point Bullets," *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 2(2), 9-19.
- Brown, S. (1984). "Police Responses to Wife Beating: Neglect of a Crime of Violence," *Journal of Criminal Law*, 12, 277-288.
- Caplan, G. (1983). *ABSCAM ethics: Moral issues and deception in law enforcement*. Cambridge: Ballinger.
- Condon, C. (1982). "The Investigation of Police Corruption in New York City," *The Police Journal*, 55, 208-218.
- Davis, K. (1975). *Police Discretion*. S1. Paul: West Publishing.
- Dershowitz, A. (1982). *The Best Defense*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Donnelly, R. (1951). "Judicial Control of Informants, Spies, Stool Pigeons, and Agent Provocateurs," *Yale Law Journal*, 60, 1091-1131.
- Elliston, F., Keenan, J., Lockhart, P., & Van Schakk, J. (1985). *Whistleblowing Research: Methodological and Moral Issues*. New York: Praeger.
- Elliston, F. (1981). "Police Use of Deadly Force: An Ethical Analysis," in S. Lagay, ed., *New Perspectives on Urban Crime*. Jonesborough, TN: Pilgrimage. *Ethics* (1983), 93; (1982), 92; (1980), 90.
- Felkenes, G. (1986, March). "The Study of Ethics as Part of a Graduate Criminal Justice Curriculum." Paper presented at the Western Society of Criminology meeting, Newport Beach, CA.
- Felkenes, G. (1984). "Attitudes of Police Officers Towards their Professional Ethics," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 12, 211-220.
- Felkenes, G. (1979, September). "Some Thoughts on Law Enforcement Training," *Criminal Justice Ethics* 35
- Education: A Concept of Professionalization," Paper presented at The International Association of Chiefs of Police meeting, Dallas, TX.
- Felkenes, S. (1980). *The Social Work Professional and His Ethics: A Philosophical*

- Analysis. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1981.) Dissertation Abstract International, Vol. 41A, p. 3725A.
- Friedman, L. (1979). "Discretion and Public Prosecution," in L. Abt and I. Stewart, eds. *Social Psychology and Discretionary Law* (pp. 157-174). New York: Van Nostrand and Rineholt.
 - Friedrich, R. (1980). "Police Use of Force: Individuals, Situations, and Organizations," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 452 (November, 1980), 82-97.
 - Fyfe, J. (1982). "Blind Justice: Police Shootings in Memphis," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 2, 707-721.
 - Fyfe, J. (1980, March). *Toward a Typology of Police Shootings*. Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences meeting, Oklahoma City, OK.
 - Gottfredson, M. & Gottfredson, D. (1980). *Decision-making in Criminal Justice*. Cambridge: Ballinger.
 - Greenwood, E. (1957). "Attributes of a Profession," *Social Work*, 2 (2), 45-55.
 - Greshman, B. (1982). "Abscam, The Judiciary, and the Ethics of Entrapment," *Yale Law Journal*, 91, 1565-1591.
 - Hefferman, W. (1982). "Two Approaches to Police Ethics," *Criminal Justice Review* 7 (1), 28-35.
 - Hindelang, M. & Gottfredson, M. (1976). "The Victim's Decision not to invoke the Criminal Process," in W. McDonald, ed., *Criminal Justice and the Victim*, pp.57-78. Beverly Hills: Sage.
 - Hudzik, J. (1984). *Federal Aid to Criminal Justice: Rhetoric, Results, Lessons*. Washington, D.C.: The National Criminal Justice Association.
 - Kant, I., *Foundations of Metaphysics and Morals* (1959). L. Beck, trans. The Library of the Liberal Arts. Bobbs-Merrill Co. (Original work published 1785).
 - Kelling, G., et al. (1974). *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment*. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.
 - Klockars, C. (1985). *The Idea of Police*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
 - Klockars, C. (1982). "A Theory of Contemporary Criminological Ethics," in F. Elliston and N. Bowie, eds., *Ethics, Public Policy, and Criminal Justice*, pp. 419-458.
 - "Los Angeles Sheriff's Deputy Charged with Murdering Unborn Baby," (1982, April 17). *Los Angeles Times*, p. 1.
 - "Ex-Los Angeles Deputy Convicted of Killing Unborn Baby" (1984, January, 15). *Los Angeles Times*, pp. 1, 3.
 - Malloy, E. (1982). *The ethics of law enforcement and criminal punishment*. Washington, D.C.: University Press.
 - Marx, G. (1982). "Who Really Gets Stung? Some Issues Raised by Police Undercover Work," *Crime and Delinquency*, 28 (2), 165-193.
 - Mascari, P. (1984). "Police Corruption and Organizational Structure: An Ethicist View," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 12 (3), 235-245.36 GEORGE FELKENES
 - Mirabella, R. & Trudeau, J. (1981). *Managing Hostage Negotiations, An Analysis of Twenty-nine Incidents*, *The Police Chief*, 48 (5), 45-47.
 - Ostrom, E. (1973). "On the Meaning and Measurement of Output and Efficiency in the Production of Urban Police Services," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 2, 93-111.
 - "Pennsylvania Police Helicopter Drops Bomb on House Occupied by Armed Group move after 24-hour Siege Involving Gun Battle"(1984, May 14). *The New York Times*, pp. 1,3.
 - *People v Barraza*, 23 Cal.3d 675, 153 Cal.Rptr. 459, 591 P.2d. 947(1979).
 - *People v Van Riper*, 65 Mich. App. 230, 237 N.W. 2d 262 (1976).
 - Reiss, A. (1980). "Controlling Police Use of Deadly Force," *Annals of the American*

- academy of political and social sciences. 452 (November, 1980), 122-134.
- Reynolds, P. (1979). *Ethical Dilemmas in Social Science Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
 - Reynolds, P. (1982). *Ethics and Social Science Research*. Englewood Cliffs: PrenticeHall.
 - Schachter, H. (1981). "Fiscal Crisis and Police Union Bargaining," *Criminal Justice Review*, 6, (2), 23-30.
 - Sherman, L. (1980). "Perspectives on Police and Violence," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 452 (November, 1980), 1-12.
 - Sherman, L. (1982). *Ethics in Criminal Justice Education*. New York: Hastings Center.
 - Sherman, L. (1978). *The Quality of Police Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
 - Skolnick, J. (1982). "Deception by Police," *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 1 (2), 40-54.
 - Sykes, G. (1986, March). *Street Justice: Moral and Ethical Defense*. Paper presented at the Western Society of Criminology meeting, Newport Beach, CA.
 - Thibault, E., Lynch, L. and McBride, R. (1985). *Proactive Police Management*.

Revised/Dec. 2015/AK

CUNY Common Core Course Submission Form

Instructions: All courses submitted for the Common Core must be liberal arts courses. Courses submitted to the Course Review Committee may be submitted for only one area of the Common Core and must be 3 credits. Colleges may submit courses to the Course Review Committee before or after they receive college approval. STEM waiver courses do not need to be approved by the Course Review Committee. This form should not be used for STEM waiver courses.

College	Kingsborough Community College
Course Prefix and Number (e.g., ANTH 101, if number not assigned, enter XXX)	PHI 6600
Course Title	Criminal Justice Ethics
Department(s)	History, Philosophy, and Political Science
Discipline	Philosophy
Credits	3
Contact Hours	3
Pre-requisites (if none, enter N/A)	N/A
Co-requisites (if none, enter N/A)	N/A
Catalogue Description	Application of ethical theories to moral issues arising in the American criminal justice system, such as civil disobedience, police corruption, whistle blowing, stop and frisk, prosecutor, plea bargaining, capital punishment, liability for unethical conduct, and the war on terror.
Special Features (e.g., linked courses)	
Sample Syllabus	<p style="text-align: center;">Syllabus must be included with submission, 5 pages max recommended KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE of the City University of New York</p> <p>Philosophy 6600: Criminal Justice Ethics 3 hours, 3 credits</p> <p>Professor Office: E-Mail: Office Hours:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Course Description</p> <p>Application of ethical theories to moral issues arising in the American criminal justice system, such as civil disobedience, police corruption, whistle blowing, stop and frisk, prosecutor, plea bargaining, capital punishment, liability for unethical conduct, and the war on terror.</p> <p>This course is an introduction to the application of normative ethical theory to moral issues that are confronted daily in the work carried out by professionals in the American criminal justice system. We will examine that application of these philosophical theories to resolving these contemporary moral issues.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Student Learning Outcomes</p> <p>The student will be able to make decisions as a criminal justice professional giving appropriate consideration to the moral dimension. The student will be able to rationally justify personal decisions not only on the basis of a professional code of ethics, but also based on some wider ranging humanitarian view. The student will not only make better decisions; but also be able to explain his/her rationale for difficult personal decisions made as a criminal justice professional</p> <p>Philosophy is both critical and conceptual. It focuses not only on what someone thinks but most importantly on the reasons that support those views. In terms of CUNY Pathways requirements, this course falls under "Individual and Society." We will be examining those theories that purport to explain and justify the ethical judgments and moral values</p>

that balance individual choice over and against the claims of justice for society and the government and the application of these theories to moral issues that arise in the American criminal justice system.

Students should be able to:

- Gather, interpret, and assess information from a variety of sources and points of view
- Construct critical arguments, provide evidence, and examine underlying premises
- Show understanding of theories exploring the nature of ethical reasoning
- Demonstrate critical perspective on ethical debates over the scope of individual choice and the claims of justice for society and the government
- Write clearly and critically.

Required Materials

Charles E. Cardwell, *Hornbook Ethics*, (Hackett Publishing Company, 2015, ISBN 978-1-62466-372-7)

Michael Braswell, Larry Miller, Jocelyn Pollock, *Case Studies in Criminal Justice Ethics* (second edition), (Waveland Press, Inc., 2012, ISBN 978-1-57766-747-6)

Grade Requirements

Class attendance and participation in discussion is emphasized, as it is in all Philosophy courses. During the course of the semester scaffolded assignments, in-class discussions and panel debates will aid the student in developing the necessary skills of argument analysis and the application of theories of Moral Philosophy to the solution of criminal justice problems. The assignments will include informal writing assignment (in-class and on Blackboard Discussion Boards). The in class discussion and activities will provide additional opportunity to refine the skill of rationally presenting and defending positions on controversial ethical issues. The following are sample topics for these assignments:

- What is the fundamental principle of morality according to Utilitarianism?
- Is "stop and frisk" permissible according to Kant's Categorical Imperative?
- Is the primary function of correctional institutions retributive or rehabilitative according to Utilitarianism?
- State and explain the Kantian argument against justifying incarceration on the basis of its value as a deterrent.

There will be two exams, a Midterm and Final, each will have an objective component consisting of multiple choice and short answer questions and an essay component. The objective tests will test the student's mastery of the ethical theories which provide the basis for solutions to the ethical questions that will be addressed during the course of the semester. For example, they will give the student the opportunity to demonstrate his/her understanding of Utilitarianism and Deontology and the analysis of arguments provided by supporters of these theories in support of their positions on issues of individual choice and the requirement of morality in policing, the courts, and the correctional system..

The student will be required to submit 2 Midterm Essays and 2 Final Essays. The essays will be from two to five pages long and submitted online to Blackboard. A sample topics for such an essays is:

- Select two articles (approved by the instructor) on the "stop and frisk" policing policy. One should defend the policy and the other should argue against the policy. Explain the moral issue concerning this policing policy. For each article state and explain the argument advanced concerning the morality of the policy, explain the moral theory that is invoked in support of the argument. Evaluate the two arguments and defend your conclusion based on your evaluation of the argument.

Each essay will require the student to provide a clearly written critical analysis of arguments provided on each side of an ethical dilemma related to criminal justice cases. The essays will require the student to defend a position on these issues showing his/her mastery of ethical reasoning as it applies to the relevant ethical debates. The student will research and read at least two instructor-approved articles from a source other than the text for the at least one of the final essays.

Grades will be determined on the basis of the following factors:

- (10%) Assignments (in class and take home)
- (10%) Class Participation & Group Assignments
- (20%) Mid-Term Exam
- (20%) Mid-Term Essays
- (20%) Final Exam
- (20%) Final Essays

Attendance and class etiquette

Attendance is generally required. At Kingsborough, students who miss more than 15% of class meetings are considered excessively absent and may receive a "WU" at the instructor's discretion. Additionally, lateness may be taken into account when assessing your class participation grade.

All electronic devices should be turned off. Once in the room, please do not leave the room. Generally, try to avoid any behavior that may be disruptive and therefore unfair to your classmates.

Academic Integrity Statement

Please, visit the following link:

http://www.kbcc.cuny.edu/studentaffairs/student_conduct/Pages/academic_integrity.aspx

Accessibility Statement

Access-Ability Services (AAS) serves as a liaison and resource to the KCC community regarding disability issues, promotes equal access to all KCC programs and activities, and makes every reasonable effort to provide appropriate accommodations and assistance to students with disabilities. Your instructor will make the accommodations you need once you provide documentation for the Access-Ability office (D-205). Please contact AAS for assistance.

Topical Course Outline

1. **Ethics and Critical Thinking**

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To develop the ability to understand the essence of good character.
- ii. To distinguish between morals, values, and ethics.
- iii. To recognize the concept of moral relativism.
- iv. To understand the importance of critical thinking to ethics.
- v. To increase awareness of the connection between etiquette and ethics.

2. **Virtue Ethics**

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand the centrality of moral virtue to understanding the ethics of Aristotle.
- ii. To appreciate the hierarchy of goods and the difference between real and apparent goods.
- iii. To recognize the distinctions among virtue ethics, stoicism, and hedonism.
- iv. To increase understanding of the linkage between the moral virtues in pursuing real goods.
- v. To develop skills in applying moral virtues and real goods in evaluating ethical dilemmas.

3. **Formalism: Carrying Out Obligation and Duty**

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand the nature of deontological ethics.
- ii. To recognize the centrality of duties versus inclinations in Kantian ethics.
- iii. To increase the ability to isolate the categorical imperative from any set of facts presented in an ethical dilemma.
- iv. To distinguish the categorical imperative from the practical imperative and hypothetical imperatives.
- v. To understand why lying is never permitted using the ethics of formalism.

4. **Utilitarianism: Measuring**

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand the nature of teleological ethics and its differences from deontological ethics.
- ii. To recognize the centrality of the principle of utility in the ethics of John Stuart Mill.
- iii. To develop an appreciation of why utilitarianism is sometimes called consequentialism.
- iv. To increase the ability to distinguish objective ways to assess the total happiness produced by an action.
- v. To appreciate criticisms of utilitarianism as a way to judge ethical action.

5. **Crime and Law: Which Behaviors Ought to Be Crimes?**

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand the differences between the consensus view and conflict view of criminal law.
- ii. To appreciate the ethical issues posed by "quality of life" offenses.
- iii. To distinguish the major perspectives on crime causation: classical, positivism, structural, and ethical.
- iv. To develop an appreciation for the linkage between Kohlberg's theory of moral development and ethics.
- v. To increase understanding of Gilligan's ethics of caring.

6. **Police: How Should the Law Be Enforced?**

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand how the Fourth and Fifth Amendments of the Bill of Rights provide the principles for police stops, searches, arrests, and interrogations.
- ii. To appreciate the threshold of "stop and frisk" and its differences from probable cause in evaluating situations for police.
- iii. To recognize the differences among nonfeasance, misfeasance, and malfeasance in assessing police decisions.
- iv. To develop an appreciation for the different causes and circumstances of police corruption.
- v. To evaluate the relationship between codes of ethics and ethical principles in producing consistent conduct.

- 7. Courts: How Ought a Case Be Adjudicated?**
Student Learning Objectives:
- i. To appreciate John Rawls' theory of justice and the "greatest equal liberty" principle.
 - ii. To recognize the importance of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct for prosecution and defense conduct.
 - iii. To understand what a "mob lawyer" is and the proper role of a defense attorney in criminal cases.
 - iv. To assess the scope of a prosecutor's discretion and its implication for ethical conduct.
 - v. To evaluate the nature of plea bargaining and the ethical dilemma it creates.
 - vi. To understand the ethical underpinnings of sentencing decisions.
- 8. Punishment and Corrections: What Should Be Done with Offenders?**
Student Learning Objectives:
- i. To understand the distinctions among the four purposes of criminal sanctions: retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, and rehabilitation.
 - ii. To recognize the issue of disparity in sentencing, how sentencing guidelines were designed to reduce disparity, and the ethical issues involved.
 - iii. To assess the issue of correctional ethics and the situations in which ethical decisions become crucial in correctional settings.
 - iv. To understand how corporal punishment and innovative sentences can be evaluated from an ethical perspective.
 - v. To distinguish the issue of punishment under the Eighth Amendment, and how capital punishment and life in prison can be evaluated using ethical principles.
- 9. Liability: What Should Be the Consequence of Unethical Conduct?**
Student Learning Objectives:
- i. To understand the nature of civil remedies for ethical misconduct, such as compensation and blacklisting.
 - ii. To recognize the double standards often placed on public officials regarding liability for conduct that is accepted when acting as private citizens.
 - iii. To evaluate the ethical dilemmas posed by sex offender notifications laws.
 - iv. To distinguish "right versus right" ethical dilemmas.
 - v. To assess the liabilities faced in unethical individual, corporate, and government misconduct.
- 10. The Future: Will We Be More or Less Ethical?**
Student Learning Objectives:
- i. To evaluate the ethical dilemma in the case of the Unabomber.
 - ii. To appreciate the reason behind the establishment of the CDC panel of ethicists.
 - iii. To understand the ethical distinctions between killing and letting die in a medical context.
- 11. Contemporary Moral Issues in Criminal Justice**
Student Learning Objectives:
- i. To understand the issue of racial discrimination in criminal justice
 - ii. To define terrorism and discriminate between warfare and crime control.
- 12. Summary and Conclusions**

Indicate the status of this course being nominated:

current course revision of current course a new course being proposed

CUNY COMMON CORE Location

Please check below the area of the Common Core for which the course is being submitted. (Select only one.)

Required Core

- English Composition
 Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning
 Life and Physical Sciences

Flexible Core

- World Cultures and Global Issues (A)
 US Experience in its Diversity (B)
 Creative Expression (C)
 Individual and Society (D)
 Scientific World (E)

Learning Outcomes

In the left column explain the course assignments and activities that will address the learning outcomes in the right column.

I. Required Core (12 credits)

A. English Composition: Six credits

A course in this area must meet all the learning outcomes in the right column. A student will:

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read and listen critically and analytically, including identifying an argument's major assumptions and assertions and evaluating its supporting evidence. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write clearly and coherently in varied, academic formats (such as formal essays, research papers, and reports) using standard English and appropriate technology to critique and improve one's own and others' texts. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate research skills using appropriate technology, including gathering, evaluating, and synthesizing primary and secondary sources. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support a thesis with well-reasoned arguments, and communicate persuasively across a variety of contexts, purposes, audiences, and media. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulate original ideas and relate them to the ideas of others by employing the conventions of ethical attribution and citation. |

B. Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning: Three credits

A course in this area must meet all the learning outcomes in the right column. A student will:

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpret and draw appropriate inferences from quantitative representations, such as formulas, graphs, or tables. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use algebraic, numerical, graphical, or statistical methods to draw accurate conclusions and solve mathematical problems. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represent quantitative problems expressed in natural language in a suitable mathematical format. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectively communicate quantitative analysis or solutions to mathematical problems in written or oral form. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate solutions to problems for reasonableness using a variety of means, including informed estimation. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply mathematical methods to problems in other fields of study. |

C. Life and Physical Sciences: Three credits

A course in this area must meet all the learning outcomes in the right column. A student will:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify and apply the fundamental concepts and methods of a life or physical science.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Apply the scientific method to explore natural phenomena, including hypothesis development, observation, experimentation, measurement, data analysis, and data presentation.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use the tools of a scientific discipline to carry out collaborative laboratory investigations.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gather, analyze, and interpret data and present it in an effective written laboratory or fieldwork report.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify and apply research ethics and unbiased assessment in gathering and reporting scientific data.

II. Flexible Core (18 credits)

Six three-credit liberal arts and sciences courses, with at least one course from each of the following five areas and no more than two courses in any discipline or interdisciplinary field.

A. World Cultures and Global Issues

A Flexible Core course must meet the three learning outcomes in the right column.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gather, interpret, and assess information from a variety of sources and points of view.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evaluate evidence and arguments critically or analytically.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Produce well-reasoned written or oral arguments using evidence to support conclusions.

A course in this area (II.A) must meet at least three of the additional learning outcomes in the right column. A student will:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify and apply the fundamental concepts and methods of a discipline or interdisciplinary field exploring world cultures or global issues, including, but not limited to, anthropology, communications, cultural studies, economics, ethnic studies, foreign languages (building upon previous language acquisition), geography, history, political science, sociology, and world literature.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyze culture, globalization, or global cultural diversity, and describe an event or process from more than one point of view.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyze the historical development of one or more non-U.S. societies.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyze the significance of one or more major movements that have shaped the world's societies.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analyze and discuss the role that race, ethnicity, class, gender, language, sexual orientation, belief, or other forms of social differentiation play in world cultures or societies.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Speak, read, and write a language other than English, and use that language to respond to cultures other than one's own.

B. U.S. Experience in its Diversity

A Flexible Core course must meet the three learning outcomes in the right column.

- Gather, interpret, and assess information from a variety of sources and points of view.
- Evaluate evidence and arguments critically or analytically.
- Produce well-reasoned written or oral arguments using evidence to support conclusions.

A course in this area (II.B) must meet at least three of the additional learning outcomes in the right column. A student will:

- Identify and apply the fundamental concepts and methods of a discipline or interdisciplinary field exploring the U.S. experience in its diversity, including, but not limited to, anthropology, communications, cultural studies, economics, history, political science, psychology, public affairs, sociology, and U.S. literature.
- Analyze and explain one or more major themes of U.S. history from more than one informed perspective.
- Evaluate how indigenous populations, slavery, or immigration have shaped the development of the United States.
- Explain and evaluate the role of the United States in international relations.
- Identify and differentiate among the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of government and analyze their influence on the development of U.S. democracy.
- Analyze and discuss common institutions or patterns of life in contemporary U.S. society and how they influence, or are influenced by, race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, belief, or other forms of social differentiation.

C. Creative Expression

A Flexible Core course must meet the three learning outcomes in the right column.

- Gather, interpret, and assess information from a variety of sources and points of view.
- Evaluate evidence and arguments critically or analytically.
- Produce well-reasoned written or oral arguments using evidence to support conclusions.

A course in this area (II.C) must meet at least three of the additional learning outcomes in the right column. A student will:

- Identify and apply the fundamental concepts and methods of a discipline or interdisciplinary field exploring creative expression, including, but not limited to, arts, communications, creative writing, media arts, music, and theater.
- Analyze how arts from diverse cultures of the past serve as a foundation for those of the present, and describe the significance of works of art in the societies that created them.
- Articulate how meaning is created in the arts or communications and how experience is interpreted and conveyed.
- Demonstrate knowledge of the skills involved in the creative process.
- Use appropriate technologies to conduct research and to communicate.

D. Individual and Society

A Flexible Core course must meet the three learning outcomes in the right column.

<p>In their Mid-Term and Final Essays, informal writing assignments, 'in-class' discussion and panel debates, students will construct arguments supporting and opposing the morality of various criminal justice practices, e.g., enforcement of "quality of life" offenses, "stop and frisk," plea bargaining, taken from criminal justice publications as well as from two or more additional instructor approved sources on philosophical ethics .The arguments will incorporate various points of view in philosophical ethics, e.g., Utilitarian, Deontological, and Virtue Ethics theories.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Gather, interpret, and assess information from a variety of sources and points of view.
<p>Students will be required to present, analyze, and explain moral arguments in favor of or opposed to various criminal justice practices. They will evaluate the logical validity and soundness of these arguments, thereby determining whether they in fact justify or forbid the criminal justice practice or issue , e.g., Utilitarian and Deontological arguments for and against policies such as "stop and frisk" and plea bargaining.. This will be demonstrated in low stakes informal writing assignments in class and on Blackboard discussion boards, as well as in the formal essays constituting parts of the Mid-Term and Final exams.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Evaluate evidence and arguments critically or analytically.
<p>Essays on the midterm and final, informal writing assignments in class, on Blackboard discussion boards, and in "in-class panel debates will require students to produce well-reasoned written analysis and evaluation of arguments on both sides of moral issues in criminal justice, e.g., Utilitarian and Deontological arguments for and against policies such as "stop and frisk" and plea bargaining. Students will be required to demonstrate that the evidence presented justifies their moral claims. j</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Produce well-reasoned written or oral arguments using evidence to support conclusions.
<p>A course in this area (II.D) <u>must meet at least three of the additional learning outcomes</u> in the right column. A student will:</p>	
<p>Students will be required to understand, explain, and defend the various normative ethical theories of Classical and Modern Philosophy, e.g., Utilitarianism, Deontology, Virtue Ethics, Feminist Ethics, that are used to defend or refute morality of practices confronting individuals in policing, the courts, and correctional institutions, and the practices associate with professionals working in these various aspects of the criminal justice system. Student will be required to use these theories to defend positions that they defend or object to in their informal writings assignments, on exams, and 'in-class" panel debates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Identify and apply the fundamental concepts and methods of a discipline or interdisciplinary field exploring the relationship between the individual and society, including, but not limited to, anthropology, communications, cultural studies, history, journalism, philosophy, political science, psychology, public affairs, religion, and sociology.
<p>In their essays, informal writing, 'in-class' discussions and panel debates, the student will be required to show how one's moral rights and obligations affect and are affected by one's role in the criminal justice system, e.g., as a defendant, police officer, corrections officer, lawyer, judge They will explain the implications of implementing - criminal justice practices, "e.g., stop and frisk., plea bargaining, parole board reviews, that may affect the rights and obligations of others in society.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Examine how an individual's place in society affects experiences, values, or choices.
<p>In their essays, informal writings, and 'in-class' discussions and panel debates, the students will be required to explain and assess the implications of various normative ethical theories (Utilitarianism, Deontology, Virtue Ethics, etc.) for moral dilemmas and issues (e.g.,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Articulate and assess ethical views and their underlying premises.

<p>plea bargaining, parole policy, constitutional right against self-incrimination, that arise in the American criminal justice system.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate ethical uses of data and other information resources to respond to problems and questions.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and engage with local, national, or global trends or ideologies, and analyze their impact on individual or collective decision-making.
<p>E. Scientific World</p>	
<p>A Flexible Core course <u>must meet the three learning outcomes</u> in the right column.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gather, interpret, and assess information from a variety of sources and points of view.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate evidence and arguments critically or analytically.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce well-reasoned written or oral arguments using evidence to support conclusions.
<p>A course in this area (II.E) <u>must meet at least three of the additional learning outcomes</u> in the right column. A student will:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and apply the fundamental concepts and methods of a discipline or interdisciplinary field exploring the scientific world, including, but not limited to: computer science, history of science, life and physical sciences, linguistics, logic, mathematics, psychology, statistics, and technology-related studies.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate how tools of science, mathematics, technology, or formal analysis can be used to analyze problems and develop solutions.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate and evaluate the empirical evidence supporting a scientific or formal theory.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulate and evaluate the impact of technologies and scientific discoveries on the contemporary world, such as issues of personal privacy, security, or ethical responsibilities.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the scientific principles underlying matters of policy or public concern in which science plays a role.

KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
of the City University of New York

Philosophy 6600: Criminal Justice Ethics
3 hours, 3 credits

Professor
Office:
E-Mail:
Office Hours:

Course Description

Application of ethical theories to moral issues arising in the American criminal justice system, such as civil disobedience, police corruption, whistle blowing, stop and frisk, prosecutor, plea bargaining, capital punishment, liability for unethical conduct, and the war on terror.

This course is an introduction to the application of normative ethical theory to moral issues that are confronted daily in the work carried out by professionals in the American criminal justice system. We will examine that application of these philosophical theories to resolving these contemporary moral issues.

Student Learning Outcomes

The student will be able to make decisions as a criminal justice professional giving appropriate consideration to the moral dimension. The student will be able to rationally justify personal decisions not only on the basis of a professional code of ethics, but also based on some wider ranging humanitarian view. The student will not only make better decisions; but also be able to explain his/her rationale for difficult personal decisions made as a criminal justice professional

Philosophy is both critical and conceptual. It focuses not only on what someone thinks but most importantly on the reasons that support those views. In terms of CUNY Pathways requirements, this course falls under "Individual and Society." We will be examining those theories that purport to explain and justify the ethical judgments and moral values that balance individual choice over and against the claims of justice for society and the government and the application of these theories to moral issues that arise in the American criminal justice system.

Students should be able to:

- Gather, interpret, and assess information from a variety of sources and points of view
- Construct critical arguments, provide evidence, and examine underlying premises
- Show understanding of theories exploring the nature of ethical reasoning
- Demonstrate critical perspective on ethical debates over the scope of individual choice and the claims of justice for society and the government
- Write clearly and critically.

Required Materials

Charles E. Cardwell, *Hornbook Ethics*, (Hackett Publishing Company, 2015, ISBN 978-1-62466-372-7)

Michael Braswell, Larry Miller, Jocelyn Pollock, *Case Studies in Criminal Justice Ethics* (second edition), (Waveland Press, Inc., 2012, ISBN 978-1-57766-747-6)

Grade Requirements

Class attendance and participation in discussion is emphasized, as it is in all Philosophy courses. During the course of the semester scaffolded assignments, in-class discussions and panel debates will aid the student in developing the necessary skills of argument analysis and the application of theories of Moral Philosophy to the solution of criminal justice problems. The assignments will include informal writing assignment (in-class and on Blackboard Discussion Boards). The in class discussion and activities will provide additional opportunity to refine the skill of rationally presenting and defending positions on controversial ethical issues. The following are sample topics for these assignments:

- What is the fundamental principle of morality according to Utilitarianism?
- Is “stop and frisk” permissible according to Kant’s Categorical Imperative?
- Is the primary function of correctional institutions retributive or rehabilitative according to Utilitarianism?
- State and explain the Kantian argument against justifying incarceration on the basis of its value as a deterrent.

There will be two exams, a Midterm and Final, each will have an objective component consisting of multiple choice and short answer questions and an essay component. The objective tests will test the student’s mastery of the ethical theories which provide the basis for solutions to the ethical questions that will be addressed during the course of the semester. For example, they will give the student the opportunity to demonstrate his/her understanding of Utilitarianism and Deontology and the analysis of arguments provided by supporters of these theories in support of their positions on issues of individual choice and the requirement of morality in policing, the courts, and the correctional system..

The student will be required to submit 2 Midterm Essays and 2 Final Essays. The essays will be from two to five pages long and submitted online to Blackboard. A sample topics for such an essays is:

- Select two articles (approved by the instructor) on the “stop and frisk” policing policy. One should defend the policy and the other should argue against the policy. Explain the moral issue concerning this policing policy. For each article state and explain the argument advanced concerning the morality of the policy, explain the moral theory that is invoked in support of the argument. Evaluate the two arguments and defend your conclusion based on your evaluation of the argument.

Each essay will require the student to provide a clearly written critical analysis of arguments provided on each side of an ethical dilemma related to criminal justice cases. The essays will require the student to defend a position on these issues showing his/her mastery of ethical reasoning as it applies to the relevant ethical debates. The student will research and

read at least two instructor-approved articles from a source other than the text for the at least one of the final essays.

Grades will be determined on the basis of the following factors:

- (10%) Assignments (in class and take home)
- (10%) Class Participation & Group Assignments
- (20%) Mid-Term Exam
- (20%) Mid-Term Essays
- (20%) Final Exam
- (20%) Final Essays

Attendance and class etiquette

Attendance is generally required. At Kingsborough, students who miss more than 15% of class meetings are considered excessively absent and may receive a "WU" at the instructor's discretion. Additionally, lateness may be taken into account when assessing your class participation grade.

All electronic devices should be turned off. Once in the room, please do not leave the room. Generally, try to avoid any behavior that may be disruptive and therefore unfair to your classmates.

Academic Integrity Statement

Please, visit the following link:

http://www.kbcc.cuny.edu/studentaffairs/student_conduct/Pages/academic_integrity.aspx

Accessibility Statement

Access-Ability Services (AAS) serves as a liaison and resource to the KCC community regarding disability issues, promotes equal access to all KCC programs and activities, and makes every reasonable effort to provide appropriate accommodations and assistance to students with disabilities. Your instructor will make the accommodations you need once you provide documentation for the Access-Ability office (D-205). Please contact AAS for assistance.

Topical Course Outline

1. Ethics and Critical Thinking

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To develop the ability to understand the essence of good character.
- ii. To distinguish between morals, values, and ethics.
- iii. To recognize the concept of moral relativism.
- iv. To understand the importance of critical thinking to ethics.
- v. To increase awareness of the connection between etiquette and ethics.

2. Virtue Ethics

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand the centrality of moral virtue to understanding the ethics of Aristotle.

- ii. To appreciate the hierarchy of goods and the difference between real and apparent goods.
- iii. To recognize the distinctions among virtue ethics, stoicism, and hedonism.
- iv. To increase understanding of the linkage between the moral virtues in pursuing real goods.
- v. To develop skills in applying moral virtues and real goods in evaluating ethical dilemmas.

3. Formalism: Carrying Out Obligation and Duty

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand the nature of deontological ethics.
- ii. To recognize the centrality of duties versus inclinations in Kantian ethics.
- iii. To increase the ability to isolate the categorical imperative from any set of facts presented in an ethical dilemma.
- iv. To distinguish the categorical imperative from the practical imperative and hypothetical imperatives.
- v. To understand why lying is never permitted using the ethics of formalism.

4. Utilitarianism: Measuring

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand the nature of teleological ethics and its differences from deontological ethics.
- ii. To recognize the centrality of the principle of utility in the ethics of John Stuart Mill.
- iii. To develop an appreciation of why utilitarianism is sometimes called consequentialism.
- iv. To increase the ability to distinguish objective ways to assess the total happiness produced by an action.
- v. To appreciate criticisms of utilitarianism as a way to judge ethical action.

5. Crime and Law: Which Behaviors Ought to Be Crimes?

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand the differences between the consensus view and conflict view of criminal law.
- ii. To appreciate the ethical issues posed by "quality of life" offenses.
- iii. To distinguish the major perspectives on crime causation: classical, positivism, structural, and ethical.
- iv. To develop an appreciation for the linkage between Kohlberg's theory of moral development and ethics.
- v. To increase understanding of Gilligan's ethics of caring.

6. Police: How Should the Law Be Enforced?

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand how the Fourth and Fifth Amendments of the Bill of Rights provide the principles for police stops, searches, arrests, and interrogations.
- ii. To appreciate the threshold of "stop and frisk" and its differences from probable cause in evaluating situations for police.
- iii. To recognize the differences among nonfeasance, misfeasance, and malfeasance in assessing police decisions.

- iv. To develop an appreciation for the different causes and circumstances of police corruption.
- v. To evaluate the relationship between codes of ethics and ethical principles in producing consistent conduct.

7. Courts: How Ought a Case Be Adjudicated?

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To appreciate John Rawls' theory of justice and the "greatest equal liberty" principle.
- ii. To recognize the importance of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct for prosecution and defense conduct.
- iii. To understand what a "mob lawyer" is and the proper role of a defense attorney in criminal cases.
- iv. To assess the scope of a prosecutor's discretion and its implication for ethical conduct.
- v. To evaluate the nature of plea bargaining and the ethical dilemma it creates.
- vi. To understand the ethical underpinnings of sentencing decisions.

8. Punishment and Corrections: What Should Be Done with Offenders?

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand the distinctions among the four purposes of criminal sanctions: retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, and rehabilitation.
- ii. To recognize the issue of disparity in sentencing, how sentencing guidelines were designed to reduce disparity, and the ethical issues involved.
- iii. To assess the issue of correctional ethics and the situations in which ethical decisions become crucial in correctional settings.
- iv. To understand how corporal punishment and innovative sentences can be evaluated from an ethical perspective.
- v. To distinguish the issue of punishment under the Eighth Amendment, and how capital punishment and life in prison can be evaluated using ethical principles.

9. Liability: What Should Be the Consequence of Unethical Conduct?

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To understand the nature of civil remedies for ethical misconduct, such as compensation and blacklisting.
- ii. To recognize the double standards often placed on public officials regarding liability for conduct that is accepted when acting as private citizens.
- iii. To evaluate the ethical dilemmas posed by sex offender notifications laws.
- iv. To distinguish "right versus right" ethical dilemmas.
- v. To assess the liabilities faced in unethical individual, corporate, and government misconduct.

10. The Future: Will We Be More or Less Ethical?

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. To evaluate the ethical dilemma in the case of the Unabomber.
- ii. To appreciate the reason behind the establishment of the CDC panel of ethicists.
- iii. To understand the ethical distinctions between killing and letting die in a medical context.

11. Contemporary Moral Issues in Criminal Justice

Student Learning Objectives:

- i. *To understand the issue of racial discrimination in criminal justice*
- ii. *To define terrorism and discriminate between warfare and crime control.*

12. Summary and Conclusions