

PSY 420/520 – Psychology & Law

Fall 2018

CRN: 16385/16386 (4 credits)

Lecture: TuTh 1200-1320

Location: 229 McKenzie

| | |
|--|--|
| Instructor: Robert Mauro, PhD Office: 327 Straub Phone: 346-4917 Email: mauro@uoregon.edu Office Hours: Th 1330-1430 & by appointment | Teaching Assistant: Ashleigh Landau, MS Office: 462 Straub Phone: E-mail: alandau2@uoregon.edu Office Hours: Th 1330-1430 & by appointment |
|--|--|

OVERVIEW

This course is devoted to an exploration of the intersection of social science and the law. We will discuss issues of identity (e.g., eyewitness identification, interrogation, lie detection, and profiling), state of mind (competency, insanity, and other legal defenses based on the defendant's state of mind), legal process (e.g., jury decision-making), social policy (e.g., legal sanctions, capital punishment, discrimination), and the use of social science methods in legal contexts. In each of these areas, we will focus on understanding the practical problems that have been addressed by the law and how social science knowledge and methodology can be used to illuminate these issues.

OBJECTIVES

By the end of the course, students should have a broad familiarity with a variety of legal issues and the ways in which social science research and methodology have been applied to address these issues. You should understand the differences in the ways that jurists and social scientists approach issues and be able to perform simple legal and scientific analyses.

MATERIALS

- Costanzo, M. & Krauss, D. (2015). Forensic and Legal Psychology: Psychological Science Applied to Law. 3rd Ed. Worth Publishers.
- Additional Readings on Canvas (see syllabus)

INCLEMENT WEATHER POLICY

If Eugene School District 4J cancels (not delays) school, we will cancel class. If Eugene School District 4J delays school, class will not be cancelled.

GENERAL WARNING

During this course, we will discuss a variety of legal cases involving crimes including robbery, rape, murder, and genocide. Images and videotapes containing disturbing depictions may be presented. If you believe that being exposed to discussions or depictions of these types of events would be injurious to you, do not enroll in this class.

INCLUSIVITY, ACADEMIC INQUIRY, and FREE SPEECH

According to University of Oregon policy:

Free speech is central to the academic mission and is the central tenet of a free and democratic society. The University encourages and supports open, vigorous, and challenging debate across the full spectrum of human issues as they present themselves to this community. Further, as a public institution, the University will sustain a higher and more open standard for freedom of inquiry and free speech than may be expected or preferred in private settings.

Free inquiry and free speech are the cornerstones of an academic institution committed to the creation and transfer of knowledge. Expression of diverse points of view is of the highest importance, not solely for those who present and defend some view but for those who would hear, disagree, and pass judgment on those views. The belief that an opinion is pernicious, false, and in any other way despicable, detestable, offensive or "just plain wrong" cannot be grounds for its suppression.

The University supports free speech with vigor, including the right of presenters to offer opinion, the right of the audience to hear what is presented, and the right of protesters to engage with speakers in order to challenge ideas, so long as the protest does not disrupt or stifle the free exchange of ideas. It is the responsibility of speakers, listeners and all members of our community to respect others and to promote a culture of mutual inquiry throughout the University community.

In this class, you are encouraged to express informed points of view on the topics discussed. You are also expected to consider divergent points of view. Ad hominem attacks should be avoided. You should think before you speak and consider whether your comments might be unnecessarily injurious to others. However, proper academic inquiry requires appropriate consideration of alternative perspectives, no matter how offensive. Learning can be uncomfortable.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

The University Student Conduct Code (available at conduct.uoregon.edu) defines academic misconduct. Students are prohibited from committing or attempting to commit any act that constitutes academic misconduct. By way of example, students should not give or receive (or attempt to give or receive) unauthorized help on assignments or examinations without express permission from the instructor. Students should properly acknowledge and document all sources of information (e.g. quotations, paraphrases, ideas) and use only the sources and resources authorized by the instructor. If there is any question about whether an act constitutes academic misconduct, it is the students' obligation to clarify the question with the instructor before committing or attempting to commit the act. Additional information about a common form of academic misconduct, plagiarism, is available at researchguides.uoregon.edu/citing-plagiarism.

SYLLABUS

| Introduction | |
|--------------|--|
| 9/25 | <p>Introduction to the Course Law & Legal Systems</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costanzo & Krauss, Chapter 1 • US Constitution Bill of Rights <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US Constitution (Remainder) |
| 9/27 | <p>Law & Legal Systems</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparative Legal Systems • Outline of the US Legal System: Introduction pp 4-17 <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amar, A. (2007). Some Thoughts on the Electoral College: Past, Present, and Future. <i>Faculty Scholarship Series</i>. Paper 790. http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/fss_papers/790 • Outline of the US Legal System (Remainder) • <i>Gomillion v Lightfoot</i> (1960) 364 US 339 http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/364/339.html |
| 9/28 | Term Project Decisions Due on Canvas 1800 |
| 10/2 | <p>Social Psychology of Evil</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zimbardo, P. (2004). A Situationist Perspective on the Psychology of Evil: Understanding How Good People Are Transformed Into Perpetrators. In A. G. Miller (Ed.), <i>The Social Psychology of Good and Evil</i> (21-50). New York: Guilford Press. <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lakoff, G. (2016). <i>Understanding Trump</i>. https://georgelakoff.com/2016/07/23/understanding-trump-2/ • Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. <i>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</i>, 67, 4, 371-378. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 10/4 | <p>Law of Evidence, Reading Cases, & Finding the Law</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selective Summary of Evidence Law • Guide to Finding the Law • <i>People v Lee</i> 96 N.Y.2d 157 <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals</i>, 509 U.S. 579 (1993) |
| 10/5 | Online Quiz #1 |

| Actions and Actors: What happened and Who Did It – Eyewitness Testimony | |
|---|---|
| 10/9 | <p>Memory & Eyewitness Testimony</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costanzo & Krauss, Chapter 7 • APA Brief in <i>Perry v New Hampshire</i> (2011) <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>Perry v. New Hampshire</i> (2012) 132 S. Ct. 716 • Kassir, S. (1998) Eyewitness identification procedures: The fifth rule. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 22, 649-653. |
| 10/11 | <p>Memory & Eyewitness Testimony</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costanzo & Krauss, 2nd Edition Chapter 11; 3rd Edition Chapter 6 • Wogalter, M., Malpass, R. & McQuiston, D. (2004). A national survey of US police on preparation and conduct of identification lineups. <i>Psychology, Crime, & Law</i>, 10, 69-82. • Wells, G. & Quinlivan, D. (2009). Suggestive Eyewitness Identification Procedures and the Supreme Court's Reliability Test in Light of Eyewitness Science: 30 Years later. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 33, 1-24. ❖ <i>State v Lawson</i> (2012) 291 P.3d 673 <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pansky, A., Koriath, A., & Goldsmith, M. (2005). Eyewitness recall and testimony. Brewer, N. & Williams, K. (Eds) <i>Psychology and Law: An Empirical Perspective</i>. New York: Guilford. • Goodman, G. & Melinder, A. (2007). Child witness research and forensic interviews of young children: A review. <i>Legal and Criminological Psychology</i>, 12, 1-19 |
| 10/12 | Online Quiz #2 |

| Actions and Actors: What happened and Who Did It – Profiling & Interrogation | |
|--|--|
| 10/16 | <p>Group & Racial Profiling: Stops, Searches, Seizures & the Fourth Amendment</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costanzo & Krauss, 2nd Edition Chapter 14; 3rd Edition Chapter 15 • <i>US v Lopez</i> (1971) 328 F.Supp. 1077 • Payne, B. (2006). Weapon Bias: Split second decisions and unintended stereotyping. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i>, 15, 287-291. • Glasser, J. (2015). Causes of racial profiling. In Glasser, J. (2015). <i>Suspect Race: Causes & Consequences of Racial Profiling</i>. Oxford University Press: New York, NY, 42-68. <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>Whren v. US</i> 517 U.S. 806 (1996) • 4th Amendment Law • Warren, P., Tomaskovic-Devey, D., Smith, W., & Zingraff, M. (2006). Driving while black: Bias processes and racial disparity in police stops. <i>Criminology</i>, 44, 709-738. |
| 10/18 | <p>Criminal Personality Profiling</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costanzo & Krauss, Chapter 5 • Alison, L., Bennell, C., Mokros, A., & Ormerod, D. (2002). The personality paradox in offender profiling: A theoretical review of the processes involved in deriving background characteristics from crime scene actions. <i>Psychology, Public Policy & Law</i>, 8(1), 115-135. • Kocsis, R. (2003). Criminal psychological profiling: Validities and abilities. <i>International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology</i>, 47, 126-146. <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canter, D., Alison, L., Alison, E., & Wentink, N. (2004). The organized/disorganized typology of serial murder: myth or model? <i>Psychology, Public Policy & Law</i>, 10(3), 293-320. • Kocsis, R. (2004). Psychological profiling of serial arson offenses: An assessment of skills and accuracy. <i>Criminal Justice & Behavior</i>, 31, 341-363. • Pinizzotto, A. & Finkel, J. (1990). Criminal personality profiling: An outcome and process study. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 14, 215-234. |
| 10/19 | Online Quiz #3 |
| 10/23 | <p>Interrogation & Confessions</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costanzo & Krauss, Chapter 2 • Kassin, S., Drizin, S., Grisso, T., Gundjonsson, G., Leo, R., & Redlich, A. (2010). Police-Induced Confessions: Risk Factors and Recommendations. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 34, 3-38. <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>Michigan v. Kowalski</i> (2011) • Amicus Brief in <i>Michigan v Kowalski</i> (2011) |

| | |
|-------|--|
| 10/25 | <p>Interrogation & Confessions</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kassin, S. (1997). The psychology of confession evidence. <i>American Psychologist</i>, 52, 221-233. • <i>Miranda v. Arizona</i> (1966) 384 US 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602, 16 L.Ed.2d 694 • Ofshe, R. (1989). Coerced confessions: The logic of seemingly irrational action. <i>Cultic Studies Journal</i>, 6, 1-15. <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiske, S., Harris, A., & Cuddy, A. (2004). Why Ordinary People Torture Enemy Prisoners. <i>Science</i>, 306, 1482-1483. • Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (2014). Excerpts from the Committee Study of the CIA's Detention and Interrogation Program. |
| 10/26 | Online Quiz #4 |
| 10/30 | <p>Lie Detection</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costanzo & Krauss, Chapter 3 • Granhag, P., & Vrij, A. (2005). Deception Detection. In Brewer, N. & Williams, K. (Eds) <i>Psychology and Law: An Empirical Perspective</i>. New York: Guilford. • Warmelink, L., Vrij, A., Mann, S., Leal, S. Forrester, D., & Fisher, R. (2011). Thermal imaging as a lie detection tool at airports. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 35, 40-48. <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ US v Semrau (2010) |

| States of Mind: Intent, Responsibility, Competence, and Insanity | |
|--|---|
| 11/1 | <p>Mens Rea & Legal Defenses</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneman, D. (2007). Understanding Affirmative Defenses. Office of Defender Services, Administrative Office of the United States Courts. ❖ R. v. Dudley & Stephens (1884) 14 QBD 273 <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Commonwealth v Kendall (2008) |
| 11/2 | Online Quiz #5 |

| | |
|------|--|
| 11/6 | <p>Competence and Insanity</p> <p><u>Required Readings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costanzo & Krauss, 2nd Edition Chapters 8 & 9; 3rd Edition Chapters 8 & 10 <i>R v M'Naghten</i> (1843) 8 Eng. Rep. 718. <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>US v Brawner</i> (1972) 471 F.2d 969 ❖ <i>Ibn-Thomas v US</i> (1979) APA Amicus Brief submitted in <i>US v. Brawner</i> (1972) 471 F.2d 969 Finkel, J. (1991). The insanity defense: A comparison of verdict schemas. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 15, 533-556. |
| | |

| Legal Decision-Making | |
|-----------------------|--|
| 11/8 | <p>Jury Trials, Jury Decision-Making and the Sixth & Seventh Amendments</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costanzo & Krauss, 2nd Edition Chapters 6 & 13; 3rd Edition Chapters 9 and 12 Smith, A. & Haney, C. (2011). Getting to the Point: Attempting to improve juror comprehension of capital penalty phase instructions. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 35, 339-350. <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>Lockhart v. McCree</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 162 Ellsworth, P. & Reifman, A. (2000). Juror comprehension and public policy: Perceived problems and proposed solutions. <i>Psychology, Public Policy, & Law</i>, 6, 788-821. Elliot, R. (1991). Social science data and the APA: The Lockhart brief as a case in point. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 15, 59-76. Ellsworth, P. (1991). To tell what we know or wait for Godot. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 15, 77-90. |
| 11/9 | Quiz #6 |

| Discrimination | |
|----------------|---|
| 11/13 | <p>Discrimination & the 14th Amendment: Due Process & Equal Protection of the Law</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costanzo & Krauss, 2nd Edition Chapters 15; 3rd Edition Chapter 14 Excerpts from <i>Brown v Board of Education</i> (1954) Excerpts from <i>Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII</i> <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin</i> (2016) 579 US APA Amicus Brief in <i>Fisher v University of Texas II</i> http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/fisher-v-university-of-texas-at-austin-2/ |
| | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 11/15 | <p>Discrimination & the 14th Amendment: Due Process & Equal Protection of the Law</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Norton, M., Sommers, S., Vandello, J., & Darley, J. (2006). Mixed motives and racial bias: The impact of legitimate and illegitimate criteria on decision-making. <i>Psychology, Public Policy, and Law</i>, 12, 36-55. Excerpts from <i>Griggs v Duke Power Co</i> (1971) Excerpts from <i>Village of Arlington Heights v Metropolitan Housing Corp</i> (1977) ❖ <i>Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins</i> (1989) 490 US 228 <p><u>Additional Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barrett, G. & Morris, S. (1993). The APA amicus curiae brief in <i>Price Waterhouse v Hopkins</i>: The values of science versus the values of the law. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 17, 201-216. Fiske, S., Bersoff, D., Borgida, E., Deaux, K. & Heilman, M. (1993). What constitutes scientific review? A majority retort to Barrett and Morris. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 17, 217-234. Saks, M. (1993). Improving APA science translation amicus briefs. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 17, 235-248. <p>Goodman, J. (1993). Evaluating psychological expertise on questions of social fact: The case of <i>Price Waterhouse v Hopkins</i>. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 17, 249-256.</p> |
| 11/16 | Online Quiz #7 |
| International Law, Social Justice, & Social Policy | |
| 11/20 | <p>International Law: Genocide (Paul Slovic)</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slovic, P. (2015). When (in)action speaks louder than words: Confronting the collapse of humanitarian values in foreign policy decisions. <i>University of Illinois Law Review Slip Opinions</i>, 24. Slovic, P. & Vastfjall, D. (2011). The More Who Die, the Less We Care: Psychic Numbing & Genocide. <p>Hollows, K. & Fritzson, K. (2012). “Ordinary men” or “Evil monsters”? An action systems model of genocidal actions and characteristics of perpetrators. <i>Law & Human Behavior</i>, 36, 458-467.</p> |
| 11/22-23 | Thanksgiving Break |
| 11/27 | <p>Judicial Selection & Decision-Making</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sheldon, C. H & Lovrich, N. P. (1983). Knowledge and judicial voting: the Oregon and Washington experience. 67 <i>Judicature</i> 235. Jamieson, K. H. & Hennessy, M. (2006). Public understanding of and support for the courts: Survey results. 95 <i>Georgetown Law Journal</i> 899. |

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 11/29 | <p>Social Science in Law: Death Penalty</p> <p><u>Required Reading</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costanzo & Krauss, Chapters 16 & 17 (2nd or 3rd edition) • <u>Ogloff, J.R.P, Chopra, S.R. (2004). Stuck in the dark ages: Supreme Court decision-making and legal developments. <i>Psychology, Public Policy & Law</i>. 10(4), 379-416.</u> • <i>Furman v GA</i> (1972) 408 US 238, 92 S.Ct. 2726, 33 L.Ed.2d 3 |
| | |
| 11/30 | Final Review 1200 (Location TBD) |
| | |
| 12/4 | Final Examination 0800 (Tuesday) |

UNDERGRADUATE CLASS REQUIREMENTS

All students will be expected to complete the examinations. Some students will choose to complete the term project (see description below). Your decision on whether to complete the term project and if so which option you choose will be due on 9/28/18 at 1800 by Canvas. If you decide on the “case” option, you should provide a rank ordering of your case preferences at that time.

P or C Only

Passable performance (i.e., a “P” or “C”) in this course will be reflected by demonstrating declarative knowledge of the material covered in this course. To demonstrate this level of knowledge, you must obtain a passing score on the set of quizzes and on the final examination. If you desire to receive only a “C” or “Pass” in this course, your only requirement is to demonstrate your understanding of the course content by receiving a weighted average score of 70% or better across the final examination and the set of quizzes together. If you select this option, the quizzes will be worth 5% of your final grade (for a total of 35%) and the final examination will be worth 65% of your final grade. You **do not** need to complete the term project if you only desire to receive a “C” or “Pass” in this course.

B- or Better

Advanced performance (i.e., an “A” or “B”) in this course will be reflected by demonstrating declarative knowledge of the material covered in this course AND demonstrating the ability to apply that knowledge to problems in the field. To demonstrate this level of ability, you must obtain at least a passing score on the set of quizzes and on the final examination AND perform well on the term project. If you desire to receive a grade higher than a “C”, you must complete the examinations AND complete the term project. If you select this option, each quiz will be worth 5% of your final grade (for a total of 35%). The Final Examination will be worth 35% of your final grade. The project will be worth 30% of your final grade. Your grade in the class will be determined by the weighted average of your scores on the examinations and project. To obtain an “A” your weighted average must be 90% or better. To obtain a “B,” your weighted average must be 80% or better. If your weighted average is over 70% but less than 80%, you will receive a “C.”

Examinations

There will be weekly online quizzes as noted on the syllabus and a comprehensive final examination.

The quizzes and will be composed of multiple choice questions designed to test declarative knowledge and your ability to directly apply your knowledge. They should help you assess your learning as the course progresses. These weekly quizzes will be relatively short. They will become available on Friday morning at 0800 and will be available for you to complete until Saturday morning at 0800. Once you begin the quiz, you will have 30 minutes to complete the quiz. You should complete the quiz on your own but you may use any materials that you have available to you.

The final examination will be held in class on the date and at the time noted on the syllabus. The final examination will be comprehensive, covering all of the material discussed during the class including the text, readings, and class presentations by the instructor and students. No materials will be available to

you during the final examination. This examination will be composed of multiple choice and short answer questions.

Term Project Description

The term project is meant to help you develop your analysis and communication skills (both written and oral). Students will be divided into two-person teams. Three two-person teams will be assigned to analyze and discuss the legal and scientific issues raised in a single legal case. Two of the two-person teams – “advocate teams” -- will be assigned to take the position of one of the parties to the case and prepare a written analysis of both the legal issues and the scientific issues raised in the case. The analysis should present arguments and evidence in favor of the assigned position and counter (if possible) the arguments expected to be presented by the opposing party. The advocate teams also will be charged with presenting the case in class. This presentation will take the form of a controlled debate similar to oral argument before an appellate court. Each of these teams will have 10 minutes to present their case. Advocate teams must provide the judge team with a brief description of their intended arguments 48 hours before the class presentation.

The third two-person team will be assigned to the role of the “judges.” This team’s role will be to prepare for the discussion of the issues raised by the advocate teams. In particular, the judge team should be prepared to ask probing relevant questions of the advocates that will help lead the judges to a deeper understanding of the arguments and that will reveal an appropriate resolution of the issues raised in the case.

To assist you in the preparation of the written paper and oral components of the project, you will be asked to meet with either the instructor and/or the teaching assistant for this course approximately one week prior to your scheduled presentation date (see schedule below). You should begin to familiarize yourself with the issues involved in the case before this meeting. If you cannot make the scheduled meeting, let the teaching assistant know as soon as possible. Although you are not required to meet with the instructional staff to discuss your term project at other times, you are encouraged to do so. You may turn in drafts of your paper prior to the paper deadline for non-prejudicial comments – just give us enough time to read the paper and return it to you – and give yourself enough time to incorporate the comments in your paper. The written portion of the project will be due two weeks after the presentation uploaded on Canvas. Team members should write their own papers. However, team members may work together to prepare the presentations and reports. Team members may adopt particular roles (e.g., law expert/science expert) or share roles.

For the advocate teams, the term project written report should have the following format:

- Title page
- Abstract
- Summary of facts of the case
- List of legal issues raised
- List of scientific issues and evidence
- Argument based on legal issues in light of available scientific evidence
- Rebuttal of counter-arguments based on legal issues and available scientific evidence
- Conclusion
- References

For the judge teams, the term project written report should have the following format:

- Title page
- Abstract
- Summary of facts of the case
- List of legal issues raised
- List of scientific issues and evidence
- Plaintiff's argument (based on legal issues in light of available scientific evidence)
- Defense's argument (based on legal issues and available scientific evidence)
- Conclusion – What the court's decision (the rule that should be followed) should be and why (based on legal issues in light of available scientific evidence)
- References

The paper should be as long as it needs to be to cover the assigned case. Cite appropriately. You may use APA, ALA, or law review styles. We expect that the paper will be about 10-15 pages long (not counting title page and references -- double spaced, 1" margins, 12 point Times New Roman font).

Term Project Grading Criteria

Papers will be evaluated on three equally weighted (5 points on each dimension for cases; 10 points on each dimension for special projects) dimensions:

Writing. The writing should be grammatical, using properly spelled words in a clear, concise, and precise manner. Words should be chosen for their precise meaning, not to "sound smart." Do not be redundant.

Content. Each issue should be covered completely using all of the appropriate materials you obtain. All materials that you use should be properly and consistently cited using APA, ALA, or Law Review styles.

Analysis. Analyses should be based on clearly stated assumptions and/or cited facts. Each step in the analysis should be clearly based on previously stated assumptions or cited facts or be a logical deduction from the assumptions or facts previously stated in the paper. Any opinions that you offer should be clearly distinguished from empirical findings and logical conclusions.

Oral presentations will be evaluated on three equally weighted (5 points on each dimension for cases) dimensions:

Presentation. The presentation should be clear, concise, and precise. Do not be redundant. Time your presentation in advance. You won't have time to cover everything.

Content. The main legal and scientific issues should be accurately summarized.

Analysis. As with the paper, analyses should be based on clearly stated assumptions and/or facts. Each step in the analysis should be clearly based on previously stated assumptions or facts or be a logical deduction from the stated assumptions or facts. Any opinions that you offer should be clearly distinguished from empirical findings and logical conclusions. You should be prepared to counter the arguments that your opponents are likely to make using the criteria above.

Each dimension will be scored using the following rubric:

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Excellent: | there may be a few minor faults but there are no substantial problems that need to be corrected |
| Very good: | there are multiple minor faults or a substantial problem but no major faults that need to be corrected |
| Good: | there are many minor faults or more than one substantial problem or a major fault, but no fundamental errors |
| Needs improvement: | there are many major problems or a fundamental error that need to be corrected |
| Poor: | there are a large number of serious problems; a major rewrite of the paper would be necessary |

Cases & Class Presentation Schedule

| Case | Topic | Initial Meeting 1300 | Class Presentation | Papers Due 2400 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Perry v New Hampshire (2012) | Eyewitness identification | 10/3/18 | 10/9/18 | 10/23/18 |
| State v Lawson (2012) | Eyewitness testimony | 10/3/18 | 10/11/18 | 10/25/18 |
| Whren v US (1996) | Group profiling | 10/10/18 | 10/16/18 | 10/30/18 |
| Michigan v Kowalski (2011) | Interrogation | 10/17/18 | 10/23/18 | 11/06/18 |
| US v Semrau (2010) | Lie detection | 10/24/18 | 10/30/18 | 11/13/18 |
| Commonwealth v Kendall (2008) | Necessity | 11/7/18 | 11/13/18 | 11/27/18 |
| Ibn-Tamas v US (1979) | Self defense/Insanity | 10/31/18 | 11/6/18 | 11/20/18 |
| Lockhart v McCree (1986) | Jury selection | 10/31/18 | 11/8/18 | 11/26/18 |
| Fisher v UT Austin (2016) | Affirmative Action | 11/7/18 | 11/15/18 | 11/29/18 |
| Price Waterhouse v Hopkins (1989) | Discrimination | 11/14/18 | 11/20/18 | 12/4/18 |

Special Topics

If you are interested in pursuing a particular topic within the realm of psychology and law, you may *request* to be excused from the term project described above and to instead spend the time exploring that topic and writing an in-depth (e.g., 20 page) term paper on that topic. Please see the instructor to discuss your proposed topic before the term project decision deadline. Special topic papers will be due on the last day of class (11/29/18) at 2400 by Canvas.

Graduate Class Requirements

Graduate students will be expected to take the final examination and to complete a term paper on a topic in psychology and law. You may take the weekly quizzes to check your learning during the course, but these will not be incorporated into your grade. You should plan on meeting with the instructor outside of class periodically during the course. Before beginning your term paper, you must have your topic approved by the instructor. Graduate term papers will be due on the last day of class (11/29/18) at 2400 by Canvas.