

Faculty of Health
Department of Psychology
PSYC 3310 3.0 Section B: PSYCHOLOGY AND LAW
Tuesdays 2:30 PM – 5:20 PM (in-person, Accolade East 001)
Fall 2026

Instructor and T.A. Information

Instructor: Andrew Brankley, Ph.D., C.Psych. (he/him/his)

Office Hours: Wednesday 10:00AM to 12:00PM ([15-min booking](#) | [30-min booking](#))

Email: brankley@yorku.ca

T.A.	Calvin Cressman	Hania Amir
Email	cress53@yorku.ca	amirhan@yorku.ca
Student Last Name	A–La	LB–Z

Questions, Inquiries, and Course Communication

Please consider the following recommendations to obtain quick and useful information. Messages will typically receive a reply within 48 hours on weekdays (72 hours on weekends/holidays). Please begin all subject lines with “**PSYC3310 F26**” to assist us in providing you with a timely response.

- **Email your TA with questions related to the assignments.** TAs will be marking your assignments, so they are best suited to answer questions related to the interpretation of instructions and the rubric.
- **Speak to Dr. Brankley.** I prefer in-person/video communication to email.
 - *Shorter Questions.* I am free during the break for questions.
 - *Longer Questions.* Please book time with me during office hours on Wednesdays 10:00 AM to 12:00PM for longer discussions (in-person or virtually).

Credit value: 3.0 | **Prerequisite(s):** HH/PSYC 1010 6.00 | **Co-requisite(s):** None

Course Credit Exclusions

GL/PSYC 3600 3.00 Psychology and Law (cross-listed as GL/SOCS 3600 3.00). Students who have completed GL/PSYC 3600 (or GL/SOCS 3600) may not also receive credit for HH/PSYC 3310 3.00. Cross-listed courses cannot be double-counted toward degree requirements.

Course website: [eClass](#) All course materials will be available on the course eClass site, unless otherwise indicated by Dr. Brankley. The site will be your central access point for course materials.

Land Acknowledgment

York University recognizes that many Indigenous Nations have longstanding relationships with the territories upon which York University campuses are located that precede the establishment of York University. York University acknowledges its presence on the traditional territory of many Indigenous Nations. The area known as Tkaronto has been care taken by the Anishinabek Nation, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, and the Huron-Wendat. It is now home to many First Nation, Inuit, and Métis communities. We acknowledge the current treaty holders, the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation. This territory is subject of the Dish with One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant, an agreement to peaceably share and care for the Great Lakes region.

Course Description

Welcome to *Psychology and Law*! This course examines how psychology helps us understand Canadian law and the justice system. We begin with how laws are created and how power is distributed, then move through policing, courts, and corrections. Topics include police decision-making, jury selection, and the use of risk assessment in parole decisions.

Program Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of this course, students should be able to:

1. Demonstrate in-depth knowledge in at least 2 sub-disciplines.
2. Articulate trends in sub-disciplines of psychology.
3. Express psychological knowledge in written form in more than 1 sub-discipline.
4. Describe and explain limits to generalizability of research findings.
5. Demonstrate ability to relate information in psychology to own and others' life experiences.

Specific Course Learning Objectives

1. Demonstrate the ability to collect, describe, understand, and think critically about research results and inferences, and their potential impact on the justice system.
2. Effectively communicate scientific research and informed conclusions on research in a range of communication media for a public audience understanding level.
3. Reflect upon own attitudes towards the justice system and critically examine how they compare to others.
4. Explore issues found at the intersection of psychology and the justice system that are of personal interest.
5. Engage peers in discussion while demonstrating an understanding of the systems of justice and empirical basis that informs recommendations for action.

Required Text

- *No Textbook!*
- Required-text cost: \$0. No textbook purchase is required. Readings are provided through open-access sources, eClass, or York University Libraries.

Course Requirements and Assessment:

Assessment	Timing	Weight
Experiential evaluations (MAC/CIA), or the MCQ alternative	MAC: Weeks 3, 4, 6. CIA: Weeks 7–10, 12, 13. MCQ alternative: Weeks 6, 9, 13 (15%, 15%, 20%).	50%
Capstone Policy Letter: Idea Pitch	October 18, 11:59 p.m.	5%
Capstone Policy Letter: Complete Draft	November 15, 11:59 p.m.	15%
Capstone Policy Letter: Final Letter	December 8, 11:59 p.m.	30%
Total	One evaluation pathway plus the Policy Letter	100%

Experiential Evaluation—MAKE-A-COP & Court in the Act! (50%)

Experiential evaluation means you learn by doing and are assessed on what you can apply. Across two evidence-informed role-playing simulations, you take roles comparable to police decision-makers and courtroom actors. You make decisions using course evidence and receive immediate feedback through live iClicker polls, outcome reveals, and concise debriefs.

Overall grading (across nine classes)

50% of your final grade is comprised of **Experiential Evaluation**

- ↳ 9 experiential classes = 3 (Make-A-Cop) + 6 (Court In The Act!)
 - ↳ Drop rule: Your lowest attempted experiential class is dropped automatically.
 - ↳ Unattempted classes cannot be dropped without approved accommodation
- ↳ 8 (Counted Classes) x 6.25% marks per class = Your final Experiential grade 50%
 - ↳ 60% Participation (i.e., 30/50 or 3.75/6.25). You earn participation credit by attending and making a good-faith attempt at the assigned activities. Come prepared to participate, experiment, make mistakes—and maybe even have fun!
 - ↳ 40% Comprehension (i.e., 20/50 or 2.50/6.25). Complete your readings and watch the lecture before class as you will apply this material in two or three multiple choice questions to check your comprehension of key concepts.

[Click here if you are missing grades for a class that has been **posted** and you **experienced!**](#)

MAKE-A-COP Simulation (Weeks 3, 4, and 6)

MAKE-A-COP (“MAC”) is an **evidence-informed role-playing game** where your team designs and operates a Canadian police service. You allocate a fixed budget across six areas, then handle fast scenarios where every decision has trade-offs. Class activities (multimedia, role-plays, iClicker polls) show how ‘good’ policies can backfire. Clear rules and shared roles make it work in a large lecture. Example of MAC Class grading breakdown:

$$6.25\% = 3.75\% \text{ (Listen \& respond to suspect six times)} + 2.50\% \text{ (3 MCQs)}$$

Court in the Act! (Weeks 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13)

Court in the Act! drops you into a **live “courtroom”**—judge, counsel, expert, witness, media—where you argue, examine, and make strategic calls under Canadian rules of evidence and procedure. Each class mixes brief prep with performance—openings, objections, and witness examinations. iClicker polls capture key rulings, and quick debriefs connect your choices to psychology and

legal standards. It's cinematic, but serious. The script guides the case, but your decisions shape the outcome, including trade-offs between persuasion and integrity. Example of CIA Class grading breakdown:

Week 9 – Eyewitness

6.25% = 3.75% (*six credibility votes during roleplay*) + 2.50% (3 MCQs)

Capstone Assignment – Policy Letter (50%)

The Capstone Policy Letter is a two-page, single-spaced brief that translates research into actionable recommendations for a Canadian justice system audience. It complements the 50% experiential block (MAC/Court in the Act) and itself accounts for 50% of your course grade across three stages: **Idea Pitch (5%, due Sunday, October 18 at 11:59 p.m., before Week 6), Complete Draft (15%, due Sunday, November 15 at 11:59 p.m.), and Final Letter (30%, due Tuesday, December 8 at 11:59 p.m.)**. The assignment asks you to write for a real Canadian justice-system decision-maker, recommend a feasible action, and support it with verified evidence.

A detailed 20-point Idea Pitch rubric will be provided with the assignment materials on eClass. The rubric is converted to the 5% course weight.

Choose a topic on a systemic or institutional Canadian justice issue tied to class themes (policy/practice, governance/oversight, courts, corrections, policing, data, equity, privacy, funding, training), not the causes of criminal behaviour. Guided Q&A and policy-writing support are offered in Weeks 2 and 11, consistent with the course's experiential learning approach; a model letter will be provided. Ground your proposal in Canadian data and oversight sources such as Statistics Canada (CCJCSS), Justice Canada (Research & Statistics), the Office of the Correctional Investigator and CSC/Public Safety responses, Auditor General reports, provincial police oversight bodies (SIU Ontario, IIO BC, BEI Québec), and the Parliamentary Budget Officer for costing—these provide current indicators, accountability findings, and fiscal baselines for policy options.

Curriculum Alignment Map

Course learning objective (CLO)	Aligned assessments	Supporting readings/activities	UDL strategies
CLO1: Demonstrate the ability to collect, describe, understand, and think critically about research results and inference, and their potential impact on the justice system.	Capstone Policy Letter (Parts 1–3: idea pitch, complete draft, final letter); MAKEACOP (Weeks 3, 4, and 6) with live iClicker checks; Court in the Act! (Weeks 7–10, 12, 13). <i>MCQ Alternative:</i> Tests 1–3 (Weeks 6, 9, 13) replace experiential classes for students who select this pathway by 11:59 PM on October 4	Week-pack readings across the term that model method-to-policy reasoning (e.g., W1 system architecture; W4 Criminal Code ss. 25–26 & IMIM; W7 bail/risk; W9 eyewitness; W10 expert evidence; W13 sentencing/risk), plus in-class debriefs connecting findings to practice.	Multiple means of representation: 1-hour pre-recorded lecture; open-access readings; infographics (e.g., law-making); model artifacts (policy-letter exemplar). Action/expression: simulations, short written analyses, or MCQ pathway. Engagement: iClicker retrieval practice; “best 8 of 9” experiential grading; extension coupons for written work; SAS-aligned accommodations.
CLO2: Effectively communicate scientific research and informed conclusions in media suitable for a public audience.	Policy Letter (Parts 2–3) with audience-focused revisions; Court in the Act! openings/examinations/objections; MAKE-A-COP press-scrum moments; Week 13 risk-communication write-up (five-level RNR).	Week 2 and Week 11 policy-writing Q&A/workshops; courtroom role briefs and exhibits; short templates/checklists for admissibility and credibility.	Action/expression: writing, speaking, rapid oral advocacy; optional MCQ pathway for students who prefer test-based demonstration. Scaffolds: exemplars, rubrics, checklists, timed speaking turns. Feedback: rubric-based feedback on policy drafts; moderated grading to maintain clarity and consistency.
CLO3: Reflect upon own attitudes toward the justice system and critically examine how they compare to others.	Complete Draft self-critique and Final Letter revision; reflection boxes embedded in MAKE-A-COP and Court in the Act!; Week 12 verdict reflection; Week 13 post-verdict debrief.	Debriefs after each simulation round; anonymous polling to surface disagreement; small-group compare-and-contrast prompts linked to weekly cases (e.g., bail triage, voir dire, eyewitness credibility).	Engagement: choice of roles/topics; low-stakes, frequent reflection; anonymous polls to reduce social risk. Representation: contrasting cases/positions (e.g., Crown/defence; expert/critic) to make differences visible and discussable.
CLO4: Explore issues at the intersection of psychology and the justice system that are of personal interest.	Policy Letter Part 1 topic selection; simulation role assignment and “choose-your-own-voir-dire” paths; optional readings to deepen chosen topics.	Curated Canadian data/oversight anchors (e.g., Justice Canada, StatCan, PBC Manual) for topic scoping; in-class office-hours/Q&A to refine focus and sources.	Engagement/autonomy: students select their Policy Letter topic and simulation roles; multiple acceptable source genres (official stats, inquiries, peer-reviewed research). Action/expression: all students complete the Policy Letter; the MCQ Alternative replaces only the experiential block.
CLO5: Engage peers in discussion while demonstrating understanding of justice systems and the empirical basis that informs recommendations for action.	Court in the Act! (team advocacy, cross examination, jury instruction application); MAKEACOP (team charter, policy trade offs); Policy Letter rubric-based feedback. <i>MCQ Alternative:</i> tests assess systems knowledge without group performance.	Structured teamwork (roles, timeboxes, turn taking); scenario labs (e.g., bail triage, lineup audit, expert gatekeeping, sentencing submission) tied to weekly readings.	Engagement/collaboration: clearly defined roles and speaking turns; consensus building tasks; immediate debriefs linking claims to evidence. Representation: visual models (IMIM, decision trees); model jury instructions to standardize terms. Action/expression: oral advocacy, brief writing, or MCQ responses.

Class Format and Attendance Policy

Each teaching week includes a **1-hour pre-recorded lecture** plus approximately 2 hours of in-person experiential learning and check-in within the scheduled Tuesday 2:30–5:20 p.m. block. All lectures, readings, and assignment materials will be available on eClass. Although in-person attendance isn't mandatory, **50% of your grade comes from participation in experiential evaluation activities** during Weeks 3, 4, 6, 7–10, 12, and 13. If you select the Multiple Choice Question (MCQ) Alternative stream, the in-class experiential portion (50%) is replaced by three MCQ tests (15% + 15% + 20%). **Attendance remains expected** because the MCQ tests draw directly on material generated through the in-class experiential activities.

Your lowest attempted experiential class is dropped automatically. An unattempted class can be dropped only with an approved accommodation. Missing class still means missing the chance to apply learning, collaborate with peers, and earn participation credit. In the spirit of experiential learning, I strongly encourage you to attend.

Academic Consideration

York now permits up to two self-reported absences per 12-week term (max 7 consecutive days) for short-term extenuating circumstances (see [Academic Consideration for Missed Course Work, Policy on - Secretariat Policies](#)). This policy does not apply to assessments worth more than 20% of the course. If you use a self-reported absence, contact the instructor within two (2) business days after the consideration period to arrange an approved remedy (e.g., re-weighting, short extension, alternate task). Longer or additional requests may require documentation as per Senate policy.

For any missed quiz, test, midterm, or late assignment, complete the [HH PSYC Missed Tests/Exams Form](#). Provide a reason for the missed course work. Failure to submit this form may result in a grade of zero. Self-reported absence requests must also be submitted through the eClass reporting tool.

Religious Accommodation

York will accommodate recognized religious observances (see [Religious Observance \(Courses Site\) | Registrar's Office | York University](#)). For in-term assessments, contact the instructor within the first three weeks of class (or as soon as a conflict is known). For final examinations in the formal exam period, submit the Religious Accommodation Agreement no later than 21 days before the start of the exam period.

Grading as per Senate Policy

The grading scheme for the course conforms to the 9-point grading system used in undergraduate programs at York (e.g., A+ = 9, A = 8, B+ = 7, C+ = 5, etc.). Assignments and tests will bear either a letter grade designation or a corresponding number grade (e.g. A+ = 90 to 100, A = 80 to 89, B+ = 75 to 79, etc.)

For a full description of York grading system see the York University Undergraduate Calendar – [Grading Scheme for 2026-2027](#)

Moderated Grading and Feedback

[Moderated grading](#) is used in this course to promote appropriate and consistent evaluations. Prior to marking each assignment, TAs meet with Dr. Brankley to discuss the purpose of the assignment and review the rubric. A small number of assignments are read and evaluated collaboratively until all parties are confident they can produce a consistent standard. Afterwards, TAs share problems, questions, and concerns with each other and Dr. Brankley to ensure a high level of performance and reduce drift.

Students will be provided with the breakdown of their grades following the assignment rubric. This feedback can be obtained on eClass. Elaboration can be provided by TAs, if requested. If the request for elaboration is for the purpose of disputing your grade, however, please see *Request for Regrade* below.

Request for Regrade

The use of moderated grading reduces, but does not eliminate, the likelihood of variability in the accurate interpretation and application of the assignment rubric. A regrade can be requested by a student if they believe the grade they received does not accurately reflect the content they submitted. Email Dr. Brankley with your request for a regrade that includes your rationale, in which you cite the incongruency between your submission, the received grade, and the rubric. If Dr. Brankley believes that there is sufficient ground for a regrade, he will regrade your entire assignment and provide detailed feedback. Note that your grade can go up or down. The request must be made within two weeks of receiving the grade.

Assessment Pathways, Accommodations & Extensions (MAC/CIA & MCQ Alternative)

York University is committed to accessible learning. If you anticipate barriers to participation, connect with Student Accessibility Services (SAS) as early as possible; I will implement any SAS-approved accommodation plan while preserving essential course requirements and academic integrity.

Two evaluation pathways

1. Experiential stream (default): MAKE-A-COP (MAC) and Court in the Act! (CIA), delivered live during the scheduled weeks.
2. Multiple Choice Question (MCQ) alternative stream: Three multiple-choice tests that replace MAC and CIA (15% + 15% + 20%)

Multiple Choice Question (MCQ) Alternative – dates and arrangements

- 15% – Week 6 (week of October 20): exact test date, time, and room will be announced on eClass.
- 15% – Week 9 (week of November 10): exact test date, time, and room will be announced on eClass.
- 20% – Week 13 (week of December 8): exact test date, time, and room will be announced on eClass.

If you have SAS exam accommodations (e.g., extra time, reduced-distraction space), those will be arranged for these tests. Religious-observance needs will be accommodated in keeping with university policy. If a short-term extenuating circumstance prevents attendance, request Academic Consideration promptly; remedies may include rescheduling or an equivalent assessment at the instructor's discretion.

If you prefer the MCQ Alternative stream, please indicate so on the “**Experiential Evaluation Opt-Out**” form on eClass by no later than **11:59 p.m. on Sunday, October 4 (end of Week 3)**. Your selection will be locked for the term to preserve fairness and logistics.

Why are there no extensions for MAC/CIA? – essential requirements

MAC and CIA are live, time-bound evaluations with interdependent roles and scheduled resources. Individual extensions would disrupt peers' learning, alter the nature of the assessment, and/or compromise fairness. Students who prefer not to participate live should select the MCQ Alternative stream.

Choosing your pathway

By default, you are in the Experiential stream. If you prefer the MCQ Alternative, submit the “Experiential Evaluation Opt-Out” form on eClass by Sunday, October 4 at 11:59 p.m. (end of Week 3) so teams and materials can be finalized. Students with newly approved or updated SAS accommodations may change pathways after Week 3; please notify me within two (2) business days of receiving your SAS letter.

Extension coupons — written work only

You have three (3) 24-hour extension coupons for written assignments. Coupons cannot be used for MAC, CIA, or MCQ tests and must be redeemed before the posted deadline by emailing your TA with the assignment name and number of coupons used.

Late policy — written work only

Without an approved extension, written assignments are penalized 2% per day (including weekends) up to 10 days (maximum 20%). After 10 days, the assignment receives a grade of zero.

Add/Drop Deadlines

For a list of all important dates please refer to [Undergraduate Fall/Winter 2026-2027 Important Dates](#)

Deadline	Fall 2026
Last date to add a course	September 22
Last date to drop without receiving a grade	November 10
Withdrawal period (W on transcript)	November 11–December 8

Add and Drop Deadline Information

There are deadlines for adding and dropping courses, both academic and financial. Since, for the most part, the dates are **different**, be sure to read the information carefully so that you understand the differences between the sessional dates below and the [Refund Tables](#).

You are strongly advised to pay close attention to the “Last date to add a course” deadlines. These deadlines represent the last date students have unrestricted access to the registration and enrolment system.

After that date, you must contact the professor/department offering the course to arrange permission.

You can drop courses using the registration and enrolment system up until the last date to drop a course without receiving a grade (drop deadline).

You may [withdraw from a course](#) using the registration and enrolment system after the drop deadline until the last day of class for the term associated with the course. When you withdraw from a course, the course remains on your transcript without a grade and is notated as ‘W’. The withdrawal will not affect your grade point average or count towards the credits required for your degree.

At least 15% of your final grade will be returned before the November 10 drop deadline, in accordance with York’s graded-feedback policy.

Information on Plagiarism Detection

All assignments will be submitted online using eClass and Turnitin. Students who do not want their work submitted to Turnitin must, by the end of the second week of class, consult with Dr. Brankley to make alternate arrangements

Electronic Device Policy

This course will be delivered in an online and in-person format. Electronic devices (e.g., tablets, laptops) are permitted during class time for course-related purposes.

Academic Conduct for Students

York University takes academic integrity very seriously; please familiarize yourself with [Information about the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty](#).

It is recommended that you review Academic Integrity by completing the [Academic Integrity Modules](#) and [York University Library Workshops](#)

Test Banks

The offering for sale of, buying of, and attempting to sell or buy test banks (banks of test questions and/or answers), or any course specific test questions/answers is not permitted in the Faculty of Health. Any student found to be doing this may be considered to have breached the Senate Policy on Academic Honesty. In particular, buying and attempting to sell banks of test questions and/or answers may be considered as “Cheating in an attempt to gain an improper advantage in an academic evaluation” (article 2.1.1 from the Senate Policy) and/or “encouraging, enabling or causing others” (article 2.1.10 from the Senate Policy) to cheat.

Group messaging and collaboration: Discord, WhatsApp, and similar tools may support learning, but sharing assessment answers or collaborating on individual work without permission can breach academic conduct rules. If you are unsure what collaboration is permitted, ask your TA or Dr. Brankley.

Homework-help sites and contract cheating: Do not post assessment questions to obtain answers or submit work completed by another person or service. Contact your TA or Dr. Brankley when you need help with course material or expectations.

Artificial intelligence (AI) use in PSYC3310

AI use is optional. You may use AI tools only to help you locate sources (e.g., to identify relevant peer-reviewed articles or credible news). You must read and verify all AI-identified sources. Retain your notes and assignment drafts. All reading, note-taking, analysis, writing, and submission content must be your own work. Submitting AI-generated text or media is prohibited and may constitute a breach of academic honesty. You are responsible for verifying accuracy and citing all sources you include. If a specific task permits broader AI use, that permission will be stated in writing on the assignment page. For more information, please refer to York University’s [*Senate-approved Academic Conduct Policy and Procedures*](#).

The assignments in this course ask you to examine factors that influence your decisions and engage with others on justice and public-safety issues. They assess how you consider the issues, the needs of the parties involved, and your own response. Submitting AI-generated analysis or prose would replace the thinking and writing being assessed.

Note: If the deadline is approaching, and you are afraid you cannot meet it, instead of resorting to GenAI, here are some alternatives available to you

- Use your extension coupons and obtain an extension (see *Missed Tests/Midterm Exams/Late Assignment*)
- Contact the TAs or Dr. Brankley for guidance and support
- Do your best and submit anyway

Academic honesty and integrity references, resources and workshops:

- Academic Conduct Policy and Procedures
<https://www.yorku.ca/secretariat/policies/policies/academic-conduct-policy-and-procedures/>
- Academic Integrity website
<https://www.yorku.ca/unit/vpacad/academic-integrity/>
- Faculty of Health Academic Honesty website
<https://www.yorku.ca/health/academic-honesty-3/>
- Faculty of Health Academic Honesty resources
<https://www.yorku.ca/health/academic-honesty/>
- SPARK Academic Integrity
<https://spark.library.yorku.ca/academic-integrity-what-is-academic-integrity/>
- York University Libraries Academic Integrity website
<https://www.library.yorku.ca/web/research-learn/citing-your-work-academic-integrity/academic-integrity/>
- York University Libraries Academic Integrity workshop “*Learn to Stop Worrying about it*”
<https://yorku.libcal.com/calendar/libraryworkshops?cid=7880&t=d&d=0000-00-00&cal=7880&inc=0>

We strongly recommend students complete the following:

- Academic Integrity Tutorial
<https://www.yorku.ca/health/academic-honesty/>
- York University Libraries Academic Integrity workshop “*Learn to Stop Worrying about it*”
<https://yorku.libcal.com/calendar/libraryworkshops?cid=7880&t=d&d=0000-00-00&cal=7880&inc=0>
- Academic Integrity learning resources [York University Libraries](#)

Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities

While all individuals are expected to satisfy the requirements of their program of study and to aspire to do so at a level of excellence, the university recognizes that persons with disabilities may require reasonable accommodation to enable them to do so. The university encourages students with disabilities to register with Student Accessibility

Services (SAS) to discuss their accommodation needs as early as possible in the term to establish the recommended academic accommodations that will be communicated to Course Directors as necessary. Please let me know as early as possible in the term if you anticipate requiring academic accommodation so that we can discuss how to consider your accommodation needs within the context of this course.

<https://accessibility.students.yorku.ca/>

Excerpt from Senate Policy on Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities

1. Pursuant to its commitment to sustaining an inclusive, equitable community in which all members are treated with respect and dignity, and consistent with applicable accessibility legislation, York University shall make reasonable and appropriate accommodations to promote the ability of students with disabilities to fulfill the academic requirements of their programs. This policy aims to eliminate systemic barriers to participation in academic activities by students with disabilities.

All students are expected to satisfy the essential learning outcomes of courses. Accommodations shall be consistent with, support and preserve the academic integrity of the curriculum and the academic standards of courses and programs. For further information please refer to: [York University Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities Policy](#).

Privacy, Recordings, & Intellectual Property

Course materials and any recordings are for enrolled students only and may not be shared outside the class. Students retain copyright in their own work. Any reuse of student images/voice beyond the course requires explicit consent. York's privacy and computing policies apply. See [Guidelines on Access to Student Records and Protection of Privacy | Registrar's Office | York University](#)

Course Materials Copyright Information

These course materials are designed for use as part of the PSYC 3310 course at York University and are the property of the instructor unless otherwise stated. Third party copyrighted materials (such as book chapters, journal articles, music, videos, etc.) have either been licensed for use in this course or fall under an exception or limitation in Canadian Copyright law. Copying this material for distribution (e.g. uploading material to a commercial third-party website) may lead to a violation of Copyright law. [Intellectual Property Rights Statement](#).

Calumet and Stong Colleges' Student Success Programming: [Calumet](#) and [Stong](#) Colleges aim to support the success of Faculty of Health students through a variety of **free programs** throughout their university career:

- Health Empowering Academic Resilience (HEAR) offers free, self-paced online workshops to help students build resilience and academic and personal skills. [HEAR workshops](#)
- [Orientation](#) helps new students transition into university, discover campus resources, and establish social and academic networks.
- [Peer Mentoring](#) connects well-trained upper-year students with first year and transfer students to help them transition into university.
- [Course Representative Program](#) aims to build the leadership skills of its Course Reps while contributing to the academic success & resourcefulness of students in core program classes.
- [Peer-Assisted Study Session \(P.A.S.S.\)](#) involve upper-level academically successful and well-trained students who facilitate study sessions in courses that are known to be historically challenging.
- [Peer Tutoring](#) offers one-on-one academic support by trained Peer Tutors.
- Calumet and Stong Colleges also support students' [Health & Wellness](#), [leadership and professional skills development](#), [student/community engagement and wellbeing](#), [Career Exploration](#), [Indigenous Circle](#), [Awards & Recognition](#), and [provide opportunities to students to work or volunteer](#).
- Please connect with your Course Director about any specific academic resources for this class.
- For additional resources/information about [Calumet and Strong Colleges Student Success Programs](#), please consult our websites ([Calumet College](#); [Stong College](#)), email us at scchelp@yorku.ca, and/or follow us on Instagram ([Calumet College](#); [Stong College](#)), X (formerly Twitter: [Calumet College](#); [Stong College](#)), Facebook ([Calumet College](#); [Stong College](#)) and [LinkedIn](#)
- Are you receiving our **weekly email** (Calumet and Stong Colleges - Upcoming events)? If not, please check your Inbox and Junk folders. If you do not find our weekly emails, then please add your 'preferred email' to your Passport York personal profile. If you need support, please contact ccscadm@yorku.ca, and request to be added to the listserv.
- Feel free to consult [additional resources and student supports at York University](#).

Course Schedule

Date	Week	Topic
Sep 15	1	Foundations of Justice
Sep 22	2	Psychologists: Ethics & Legal Boundaries
Sep 29	3	Policing: Systems & Roles
Oct 06	4	Police Decisions: Force & Bias
Oct 13	5	Reading Week (no class)
Oct 20	6	Interviews: Memory & Suggestibility
Oct 27	7	Pre-Trial: Bail, Risk & Guilt
Nov 03	8	Jury Selection & Pretrial Publicity
Nov 10	9	Eyewitnesses: Memory & Confidence
Nov 17	10	Expert Testimony: Bias & Admissibility
Nov 24	11	Mental Disorder & NCRMD
Dec 01	12	Jury Deliberation & Doubt
Dec 08	13	Sentencing, Risk & Parole

The remaining pages of this document contain details of the course content.

#	System Stage	Lecture Title	Experiential Exercises
		Core Psychological Focus	
1	Foundations	<i>Foundations of Justice</i>	Q&A & “What is Justice?”, Values, Introduction to MAKE-A-COP .
		Legitimacy, procedural justice, public trust, legal consciousness	
2	Ethical Boundaries	<i>Psychologists in the System: Rules, Ethics & Legal Boundaries</i>	Q&A / Advice for Policy Letter & “Red Flag or Routine?” applied ethics game. Begin building your service for MAKE-A-COP .
		Charter rights, TCPS2, CPA Code, dual roles in forensic contexts	
3	Police Institutions	<i>Policing in Canada: Systems, Roles & Recruitment</i>	MAKE a COP : Recruitment-pathway mapping
		Structure, oversight, legitimacy, public perceptions	
4	Police Decision-Making	<i>Discretion, Use-of-Force, & Cognitive Bias</i>	MAKE a COP : Use-of-force scenarios + IMIM mapping & s. 25 justification notes
		Rapid appraisal, stress, implicit bias, decision heuristics	
5	—	<i>Reading Week</i>	—
6	Police Evidence Collection	<i>Interviewing Witnesses & Suspects: Memory, Influence & Suggestibility</i>	MAKE a COP : Choose your interviewing method (iClicker) + PEACE plan drafting lab
		Memory retrieval principles; contamination; voluntariness (<i>R. v. Oickle</i>)	
7	Pre-Trial Decisions	<i>The Accused Enters: Bail, Risk & the Weight of Guilt</i>	Court in the Act! : Bail triage lab, Gladue bench note, Interpreting Static-99R
		Risk assessment, heuristics, Gladue, legal meaning of guilt	
8	Jury Formation	<i>Choosing Justice: Jury Selection & Pretrial Publicity</i>	Court in the Act! : Media bias lab, Choose Your own <i>Voir Dire</i> , Ethical Scenario “Just Got Picked”
		Voir dire, media bias, group psychology, impartiality	
9	Trial – Witness Testimony	<i>Eyewitnesses in Court: Memory, Confidence & Contamination</i>	Court in the Act! : Witness Testimony + Cross-Examination
		Lineup science, confidence, trauma memory, wrongful conviction	
10	Trial – Expert Testimony	<i>Experts on the Stand: Bias, Science & Admissibility</i>	Court in the Act! : Competing expert reports—admit or exclude + bias-mapping checklist
		Cognitive bias, admissibility (Mohan/Abbey), forensic quality	
11	Fitness & Responsibility	<i>Mental Disorder & Criminal Responsibility</i>	Q&A / Advice for policy letter & “Are they responsible?” vignettes + FIT-R scoring drill; Review Board disposition role-play
		NCRMD, fitness to stand trial, stigma, forensic psychiatry	
12	Jury Deliberation	<i>The Verdict: Decision-Making Under Doubt</i>	Court in the Act! : Jury vote, deliberation poll, and verdict reflection + unanimity vs. majority simulation
		Beyond a reasonable doubt (<i>Lifchus</i>); heuristics, persuasion, and moral reasoning; procedural safeguards & deliberation protocols; group dynamics (herding, stubbornness)	
13	Corrections & Public Safety	<i>Sentencing & Risk: Justice After the Verdict</i>	Court in the Act : Sentencing submission + post verdict debrief + risk communication writeup (five level RNR)
		s. 718 purposes & principles; Gladue at sentencing and Indigenous Justice Strategy context; risk tools (Static-99R, VRS-SO)—use & limits; RNR vs. GLM; parole decision psychology; Dangerous Offender regime	

Week 1 – Foundations of Justice: Law, Government, and the Architecture of Canadian Criminal Justice

Learning Objectives

1. **Define** the concept of *law* and **explain** its primary societal functions. (*Remember–Understand*)
2. **Illustrate** how laws are created in Canada, describing the roles of Parliament, the executive (Royal Assent), and the judiciary's power of interpretation. (*Understand–Apply*)
3. **Summarize** the structure and interplay of Canada's legislative, executive, and judicial branches. (*Understand*)
4. **Diagram** the flow of a typical criminal case—from police contact through courts to corrections—identifying the key decision points for each institution. (*Understand–Apply*)
5. **Differentiate** federal, provincial, and territorial responsibilities for policing, courts, and corrections using concrete examples. (*Analyze*)
6. **Describe** at least three ways psychologists contribute to evidence-based practice within the Canadian justice system (e.g., forensic assessment, eyewitness research, risk communication). (*Understand–Apply*)

Required Readings (7 readings, ~22 pages, ~1 hour @ 150 WPM)

- ❑ Smith, S. M., Ternes, M., Stephens, S., & Carter-Rogers, K. (2019). Psychology and the law in Canada. In M. E. Norris (Ed.), *The Canadian Handbook for Careers in Psychological Science*. Kingston, ON: eCampus Ontario. Licensed under CC BY NC 4.0. Retrieved from <https://ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub/psychologycareers/chapter/psychology-and-the-law-in-canada/>
- ❑ Department of Justice Canada. (2020). *How new laws and regulations are created* [Infographic]. <https://justice.canada.ca/eng/laws-lois/pdf/infograph-laws-lois.pdf>
- ❑ Department of Justice Canada. (2021a). *The judicial structure*. <https://justice.canada.ca/eng/csj-sjc/just/07.html>
- ❑ Department of Justice Canada. (2021b). *What is the law?* <https://justice.canada.ca/eng/rp-pr/cp-pm/just/02.html>

- ❑ Department of Justice Canada. (2024). *The Canadian Constitution*.
<https://justice.canada.ca/eng/csjsjc/just/05.html>
- ❑ Brideau, I., & Brosseau, L. (2019, October 16). *The distribution of legislative powers: An overview* (Publication No. 2019-35-E). Library of Parliament.
<https://lop.parl.ca/staticfiles/PublicWebsite/Home/ResearchPublications/BackgroundPapers/PDF/2019-35-e.pdf>
- ❑ Statistics Canada & Department of Justice Canada. (2018, June 27). *Overview of the Adult Criminal Justice System* (Juristat Bulletin — Quick Fact No. 2018-1). Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-005-x/2018001/article/54967-eng.htm>

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
<i>What is the law?</i> (Department of Justice Canada, 2021b)	LO1: Defines the concept of law and introduces its core purposes, helping you recognize law's authority and function in society.
<i>The Canadian Constitution</i> (Department of Justice Canada, 2024)	LO2 & LO3: Explains how constitutional principles guide law-making and the separation of powers, enabling you to distinguish the roles of Parliament, the executive, and the judiciary.
<i>How new laws and regulations are created</i> (Department of Justice Canada, 2020)	LO2: Visualizes the legislative process from bill to Royal Assent, supporting your understanding of formal law creation in Canada.
<i>The judicial structure</i> (Department of Justice Canada, 2021a)	LO3 & LO5: Describes the hierarchy and responsibilities of Canada's courts, helping you summarize the branches of government and identify jurisdictional authority.
<i>The distribution of legislative powers</i> (Library of Parliament, 2019)	LO5: Clarifies how federal, provincial, and territorial governments share justice responsibilities, giving you concrete examples of legal jurisdiction.
<i>Overview of the Adult Criminal Justice System</i> (Statistics Canada & Department of Justice Canada, 2018)	LO4: Diagrams the typical flow of a criminal case, from police contact to corrections, showing you key institutional decision points and transitions.
<i>Psychology and the Law in Canada</i> (Smith et al., 2019)	LO6: Demonstrates how psychologists influence justice through research and practice, helping you explore real-world contributions like forensic assessment and eyewitness studies.

Optional Reading	How it Enriches Course Learning
Duff, J. (2024, February). <i>Perceptions of and confidence in Canada's criminal and civil justice systems: Key findings from the 2023 National Justice Survey.</i> Department of Justice Canada. https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/jr/pcccccjs-pcsjpcc/index.html	Offers current empirical insights into public trust in justice institutions. Supports LO 1 (law's societal role) and LO 4 (system flow) by grounding abstract concepts in real-world perceptions.
Hopkins, V., & Lawlor, A. (2023). Behavioural insights and public policy in Canada. <i>Canadian Journal of Political Science</i> , 56(2), 435–450. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423923000100	Highlights how psychological research influences Canadian law-making and policy through heuristics and nudging. Enhances LO 2 (law creation) with practical, contemporary application.
Roberts, J. V. (2004, November). <i>Public confidence in criminal justice: A review of recent trends (Report No. 2004-05).</i> Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada. https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/pblc-cnfdnc-crmnl/index-en.aspx	Provides a historical baseline for trends in justice system confidence. Shared LO focus on institutional legitimacy (LO 1, LO 5). Useful for contrast with more recent surveys.
Saulnier, A., & Sivasubramaniam, D. (2021). Procedural justice concerns and technologically mediated interactions with legal authorities. <i>Surveillance & Society</i> , 19(3), 317–337. https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v19i3.14112	Explores how online and digital systems shape perceptions of fairness and access. Enhances LO 1 and LO 4 by exploring law's evolving interface with society.

Week 2 – Research Ethics in Canadian Legal Psychology: Charter, Codes, and Power

Learning Objectives

1. **Explain** the core ethical principles guiding psychological research and practice within Canada's justice system (Respect for Persons, Concern for Welfare, Justice). (*Understand–Apply*)
2. **Illustrate** how the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms constrains and informs research with justice-involved populations. (*Understand–Apply*)
3. **Compare** the Canadian Code of Ethics for Psychologists and TCPS2 guidelines, highlighting their complementary roles. (*Analyze*)
4. **Evaluate** how structural power and colonial legacies influence research design and policy recommendations in legal psychology settings. (*Evaluate*)
5. **Identify** practical strategies for safeguarding privacy and cultural safety when conducting or communicating legal psychology research. (*Remember–Apply*)

Required Readings (4 readings, ~50 pages, ~3 hours @ 150 WPM)

- ❑ Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (U.K.), 1982, c. 11. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/const/page-15.html>

Section To Be Read	Why It Matters
Section 2 – Fundamental Freedoms	Freedom of expression, assembly, religion—sets the baseline for voluntary participation and informed consent in studies.
Section 7 – Life, Liberty and Security of the Person	Core “legal rights” clause that underpins ethical safeguards for detainees, prisoners, and court-ordered assessments.
Sections 8–12 – Search & Seizure, Detention, Legal Rights, Cruel and Unusual Treatment	These limit state power and shape data-collection rules (e.g., privacy, interviews, use-of-force research).
Section 15 – Equality Rights	Protects against discrimination; critical for sampling, equity analyses, and policy recommendations.
Section 24 – Enforcement & Remedies (skim)	Explains how Charter breaches are remedied—useful context for discussing research on court challenges.

- ❑ Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, & Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (2022). *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans – TCPS 2 (2022)* (Chs. 1–3 & 9, pp. 1–12, 125–140). <https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/documents/tcps2-2022-en.pdf>
- ❑ Canadian Psychological Association. (2017). *Canadian code of ethics for psychologists* (4th ed.). https://cpa.ca/docs/File/Ethics/CPA_Code_2017_4thEd.pdf
- ❑ Supreme Court of Canada. (1994). *R. v. Mohan*, [1994] 2 S.C.R. 9 (Headnote & majority reasons, pp. 1–6). <https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1131/index.do>
- **Case snapshot:** The Court set four criteria for admitting expert evidence—relevance, necessity, absence of exclusionary rule, and proper qualification. Psychologists’ testimony was central, making this a landmark in defining ethical and professional boundaries for expert witnesses.

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Sections 2, 7, 8–12, 15; skim 24) (<i>Department of Justice Canada, n.d.</i>) Link	LO1 & LO2: Helps you explain core ethical principles like Respect for Persons and Concern for Welfare in legal settings, and illustrates how constitutional protections constrain research with justice-involved individuals (e.g., consent, privacy, equity).
Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving	LO1, LO3 & LO4: Helps you explain Canada’s foundational research ethics principles, compare the TCPS 2 with the CPA Code, and

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Humans (TCPS 2, 2022) – Chapters 1–3 & 9 (<i>Panel on Research Ethics, 2022</i>) Link	evaluate how structural power and colonial histories influence ethical guidance—especially in Chapter 9 on research with Indigenous peoples.
Canadian Code of Ethics for Psychologists (4th ed., pp. 1–10) (<i>Canadian Psychological Association, 2017</i>) Link	L01, L03 & L05: Helps you explain ethical principles guiding psychologists in legal contexts, compare them with TCPS 2 principles, and identify strategies to ensure cultural safety and protect participants' privacy.
R.v. Mohan – Headnote & Majority Reasons (pp. 1–6) (<i>Supreme Court of Canada, 1994</i>) Link	L01, L02 & L05: Helps you explain the legal standards for expert testimony and evaluate ethical limits for psychological evidence, particularly in light of participant welfare and justice system constraints.

Week 3 – Policing in Canada: Mandates, Structures, and Psychological Perspectives

Learning Objectives

1. **Identify** the legislative and constitutional mandates that empower Canadian police services, including the *Criminal Code*, Ontario's Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019, and the federal RCMP Act. (*Remember–Understand*)
2. **Differentiate** among the structures, jurisdictions, and core functions of the Toronto Police Service (municipal), Ontario Provincial Police (provincial), and Royal Canadian Mounted Police (federal). (*Understand–Analyze*)
3. **Describe** the standard recruitment pathways for each policing level, outlining minimum qualifications, selection stages, and initial training programs. (*Understand*)
4. **Compare** entry-level roles available within municipal, provincial, and federal services (e.g., frontline patrol, highway safety, national security) and explain how assignment processes differ across agencies. (*Analyze–Apply*)
5. **Summarize** psychological research on who chooses policing as a career, including personality traits, motivations, and demographic trends. (*Understand–Analyze*)
6. **Explain** how psychological principles and assessments (e.g., cognitive ability tests, personality inventories, structured interviews) inform police hiring and suitability evaluations at different service levels. (*Understand–Apply*)
7. **Critically assess** major psychological theories and commentaries on the social functions of policing in Canadian society, considering legitimacy, community relations, and public trust. (*Evaluate–Analyze*)

Required Readings (6 readings, ~ 38 pages, ~2 hours @ 150 WPM)

- ☐ Canadian Psychological Association. (2013). *The pre-employment clinical assessment of police candidates: Principles and guidelines* for Canadian psychologists (pp. 1–10). <https://cpa.ca/docs/File/News/2013-07/Police%20assess%20guidelines%20April2013final.pdf>
- ☐ Di Nota, P. M., Arpaia, J., Boychuk, E. C., Collins, P. I., & Andersen, J. P. (2021). Testing the efficacy of a 1-day police decision-making and autonomic modulation intervention: A quasi-random pragmatic controlled trial. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 719046. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.719046>
- ☐ Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (2024). *Raison d'être, mandate and role, and operating context*. <https://www.rcmp.ca/en/corporate-information/publications->

[and-manuals/2024-25-departmental-plan/raison-detre-mandate-and-role-and-operating-context](https://www.rcmp.ca/en/corporate-information/publications-and-manuals/2024-25-departmental-plan/raison-detre-mandate-and-role-and-operating-context)

- ☐ Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General. (2023). *Policing in Ontario*.
<https://www.ontario.ca/page/policing-ontario>
- ☐ Ontario Provincial Police. (n.d.). *Become a police officer*.
<https://www.opp.ca/index.php?id=143&lng=en>
- ☐ Toronto Police Service. (2023). *Police constable recruitment*.
<https://www.tps.ca/careers/police-constable/>

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Canadian Psychological Association. (2013). <i>The pre-employment clinical assessment of police candidates: Principles and guidelines for Canadian psychologists</i> (pp. 1–10).	LO6: Helps you understand how psychological tools like cognitive tests, personality inventories, and structured interviews are used to evaluate police suitability at different service levels.
Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (2024). <i>Raison d'être, mandate and role, and operating context</i> . https://www.rcmp.ca/en/corporate-information/publications-and-manuals/2024-25-departmental-plan/raison-detre-mandate-and-role-and-operating-context	LO1 & LO2: Helps you identify the RCMP's federal legislative and constitutional mandate and understand its core policing functions and jurisdictional responsibilities.
Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General. (2023). <i>Policing in Ontario</i> .	LO1 & LO2: Helps you identify the statutory frameworks governing Ontario police and differentiate policing roles across municipal, provincial, and federal levels.
Ontario Provincial Police. (n.d.). <i>Become a police officer</i> . https://www.opp.ca/index.php?id=143&lng=en	LO3 & LO4: Helps you describe how the OPP recruits and trains officers, and compare entry-level roles and assignments within provincial policing.
Toronto Police Service. (2023). <i>Police constable recruitment</i> .	LO3 & LO4: Helps you understand municipal police recruitment and compare roles across different levels of policing.
Di Nota, P. M., et al. (2021). <i>Testing the efficacy of a 1-day police decision-making and autonomic modulation intervention: A quasi-random pragmatic controlled trial</i> . <i>Frontiers in Psychology</i> , 12, 719046.	LO5, LO6 & LO7: Helps you summarize who chooses policing as a career, understand how psychological research informs hiring and training, and critically assess the broader social and psychological functions of policing.

Week 4 – Police Operational Decision-Making: Discretion, Use-of-Force, & Cognitive Bias

Learning Objectives

1. **Explain** the legal and policy frameworks that regulate police discretion and use-of-force in Canada (e.g., *Criminal Code* s. 25, provincial standards, IMIM). (*Understand–Apply*)
2. **Describe** the psychological processes underlying rapid threat assessment, including stress physiology, perceptual narrowing, and heuristic decision-making. (*Understand*)
3. **Analyze** how implicit bias and situational factors influence disproportionate uses of force across social groups. (*Analyze*)
4. **Evaluate** evidence-based training interventions aimed at reducing cognitive bias and improving decision quality. (*Evaluate*)
5. **Apply** psychological principles to critique a real Canadian use-of-force case, identifying key decision points and alternative responses. (*Apply–Evaluate*)

Required Readings (5 readings, ~37 pages, ~2 hours @ 150 WPM)

- ☐ Anderson, G. S., Di Nota, P. M., Metz, G. A. S., & Andersen, J. P. (2019). The impact of acute stress physiology on skilled motor performance: Implications for policing. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, Article 2501. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02501/full>
 - Read Abstract, Introduction, and Discussion (omit Methods, detailed results tables, and literature review subsections not directly on acute stress in policing). (~10 pages)
- ☐ Canadian Criminal Code. (1985). *Criminal Code* (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46), Sections 25–26. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/>
- ☐ Di Nota, P. M., Arpaia, J., Boychuk, E. C., Collins, P. I., & Andersen, J. P. (2021). Testing the efficacy of a 1-day police decision-making and autonomic modulation intervention: A quasi-random pragmatic controlled trial. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 719046. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.719046>
 - Read Abstract, Introduction, Methods overview (omit recruitment detail not tied to intervention design), and Discussion (omit literature review, statistical outputs, appendices). (~8–9 pages)

- ❑ Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (2021). Incident Management Intervention Model. <https://rcmp.ca/en/police-intervention/incident-management-intervention-model>
 - Read Overview section, core diagram, and “Application of the Model” (omit appendices, historical notes, and duplicate graphics). (~5–6 pages)
- ❑ Worden, R. E., McLean, S. J., Engel, R. S., Cochran, H., Corsaro, N., Reynolds, D., Najdowski, C. J., & Isaza, G. T. (2020). *The impacts of implicit bias awareness training in the NYPD (Executive summary and methodology)*. John F. Finn Institute for Public Safety. https://www.nyc.gov/assets/nypd/downloads/pdf/analysis_and_planning/impacts-of-implicit-bias-awareness-training-in-%20the-nypd.pdf
 - Read Executive Summary and Methodology overview (omit appendices). (~8–9 pages)

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Anderson, G. S., Di Nota, P. M., Metz, G. A. S., & Andersen, J. P. (2019). <i>The impact of acute stress physiology on skilled motor performance: Implications for policing</i> .	LO2 & LO4: Helps you describe how acute stress affects perception and motor control, and evaluate its implications for officer decision-making.
Canadian Criminal Code. (1985). <i>Criminal Code (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46), Sections 25–26</i> .	LO1: Helps you explain the legal authority and limitations governing use of force by police under federal Canadian law.
Di Nota, P. M., et al. (2021). <i>Testing the efficacy of a 1-day police decision-making and autonomic modulation intervention</i> .	LO2, LO4 & LO5: Helps you understand how stress affects operational decisions, evaluate evidence-based police training, and apply this knowledge to critique a Canadian case. (<i>Read: Introduction, Methods, Discussion only.</i>)
Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (2021). <i>Incident Management Intervention Model</i> . https://rcmp.ca/en/police-intervention/incident-management-intervention-model	LO1 & LO5: Helps you connect the legal framework to field decisions and apply situational judgment models in a real-world use-of-force critique.
Worden, R. E., McLean, S. J., Engel, R. S., et al. (2020). <i>Impacts of implicit bias awareness training in the NYPD: Executive summary & methodology</i> .	LO3 & LO4: Helps you analyze the influence of implicit bias in police decision-making and evaluate the effectiveness of large-scale bias training programs.

Week 5 – Reading Week (No class)

Week 6 – Investigative Interviewing & Evidence Gathering

Learning Objectives

1. Describe Canadian legal requirements and best practices for investigative interviewing. (*Understand*)
2. Explain cognitive principles of memory retrieval informing PEACE and Cognitive Interview. (*Understand–Apply*)
3. Analyze factors leading to false confessions and suggestibility. (*Analyze*)
4. Evaluate evidence-based interviewing techniques for vulnerable populations. (*Evaluate*)
5. Draft a PEACE interview plan for a hypothetical case. (*Apply–Create*)

Required Readings (4 readings, ~38 pages, ~2 hours @ 150 WPM)

- ☐ Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (2017). The RCMP Phased Interview Model for Suspects (presentation excerpt, 12 pp.). <https://www.cpskn.ca/wp-content/uploads/stanhope/2017/presentations/Darren%20Carr%20Interviewing%20-%20Stanhope%202017.pdf>
- ☐ Snook, B., Fahmy, W., Fallon, L., Lively, C. J., Luther, K., Meissner, C. A., Barron, T., & House, J. C. (2020). Challenges of a “toolbox” approach to investigative interviewing: A critical analysis of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police’s (RCMP) Phased Interview Model. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 26(3), 261–273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000245>
- ☐ McCartney, S., & Patterson, C. (2021). Investigative interviewing. In *Communications in law enforcement and the criminal justice system: Key principles* (approx. 10 pp.). BCcampus. <https://pressbooks.bccampus.ca/communicationinlawenforcement/chapter/investigative-interviewing/>
- ☐ Supreme Court of Canada. (2000). *R. v. Oickle*, [2000] 2 S.C.R. 3 (Headnote, 6 pp.) <https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1801/index.do>

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (2017). <i>The RCMP Phased Interview Model for Suspects</i> (presentation excerpt, 12 pp.).	LO1, LO2 & LO5: Helps you describe Canada’s legal and procedural standards for interviewing suspects, understand the memory science informing phased models like PEACE, and apply those principles to structure your own interview plan.
Snook, B., et al. (2020). <i>Challenges of a “toolbox” approach to investigative interviewing.</i> <i>Psychology, Public Policy, and Law</i> , 26(3), 261–273.	LO3 & LO4: Helps you analyze the risks of inconsistent interviewing practices, and evaluate how evidence-based approaches support ethical interviewing—especially with vulnerable or suggestible individuals.
McCartney, S., & Patterson, C. (2021). <i>Investigative interviewing.</i> In <i>Communications in law enforcement and the criminal justice system: Key principles</i> (approx. 10 pp.).	LO1, LO2 & LO4: Helps you describe interviewing best practices, understand cognitive retrieval principles, and evaluate methods tailored to vulnerable witnesses and victims.
Supreme Court of Canada. (2000). <i>R. v. Oickle</i> , [2000] 2 S.C.R. 3 (Headnote, 6 pp.).	LO1 & LO3: Helps you understand legal limits on coercive interviewing and analyze how Canadian courts assess the voluntariness and reliability of confessions.

Week 7 – The Accused Enters: Bail, Risk & the Weight of Guilt

Learning Objectives

1. Summarize bail and sentencing frameworks under Canadian law, including the role of Gladue principles (*describe, outline, classify*).
2. Explain how cognitive heuristics (e.g., anchoring, framing) may shape judicial bail and sentencing decisions (*interpret, exemplify, discuss*).
3. Evaluate empirical-actuarial risk tools (e.g., Static-99R) and their application in pre-trial release decisions (*appraise, critique, justify, defend*).
4. Analyze how structured risk assessments support or constrain judicial discretion (*differentiate, organize, compare, contrast*).
5. Reflect on the legal meaning of guilt and the personal stakes of criminal responsibility (*articulate, evaluate, integrate, self-assess*).

Required Readings (5 readings, ~20 pages total, ~1.5 hours @ 150 WPM.)

- ☐ Dhami, M. K. (2003). Psychological models of professional decision making. *Psychological Science*, 14(2), 175–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.01438>
- ☐ Hanson, R. K. (2009). *The psychological assessment of risk for crime and violence*. *Canadian Psychology / Psychologie Canadienne*, 50(3), 172–182. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015726>. https://hope-radproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/HansonR_2009_The-Psychological-Assessment-of-Risk-for-Crime-and-Violence.pdf
- ☐ Canadian Civil Liberties Association. (2024). Still failing: *The deepening crisis of bail and pre-trial detention in Canada*. https://ccla.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/CCLA_Bail-Report-V2.pdf
 - Read pages 1–5 only.
- ☐ Department of Justice Canada. (2023). *Fact sheet: The bail process*. <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/bail-caution/index.html>
 - Read pages 1–4 only.
- ☐ Supreme Court of Canada. (1997). *R. v. Lifchus*, [1997] 3 S.C.R. 320. <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1997/1997canlii319/1997canlii319.html>
 - Read paragraphs 36–39 only.

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Hanson, R. K. (2009). <i>The psychological assessment of risk for crime and violence</i> .	LO3 & LO4: Explains the scientific basis for risk prediction tools, the difference between static and dynamic risk factors, and the ethical and practical considerations for use in forensic contexts.
Canadian Civil Liberties Association. (2024). <i>The deepening crisis of bail and pre-trial detention in Canada</i> (pp. 1–5).	LO1 & LO5: Provides critical context for how pre-trial detention disproportionately affects marginalized communities and underscores the consequences of being found guilty before trial.
Department of Justice Canada. (2023). <i>Fact sheet: The bail process</i> (pp. 1–4).	LO1: Outlines the legal process and decision-making framework governing bail hearings in Canada. Supports students in summarizing bail frameworks.
Supreme Court of Canada. (1997). <i>R. v. Lifchus</i> (paras. 36–39).	LO5: Clarifies the legal definition of “beyond a reasonable doubt” and helps students reflect on the stakes of finding someone guilty within the justice system.

Optional Reading	How It Enriches Objectives
Danziger, S., Levav, J., & Avnaim-Pesso, L. (2011). Extraneous factors in judicial decisions. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i> , 108(17), 6889–6892. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1018033108	Illustrates how irrelevant influences (e.g., decision fatigue) can shift rulings, enriching discussion of heuristics and vigilance against cognitive drift → Objectives 2 & 4.
Skeem, J. L., & Monahan, J. (2011). Current directions in violence risk assessment. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i> , 20(1), 38–42. https://gspp.berkeley.edu/assets/uploads/research/pdf/03-2011_Current_Directions_in_Violence_Risk_Assessment.pdf	Concise overview of structured risk assessment (actuarial, SPJ) and practice implications, strengthening critical evaluation of tools and discretion → Objectives 3 & 4.

Week 8 – Jury Selection & Pretrial Publicity

Learning Objectives

1. Identify Canadian legal provisions governing jury selection, challenges for cause, the abolition of peremptory challenges, representativeness, and impartiality (*Remember–Understand*)
2. Explain psychological factors influencing juror selection procedures (voir dire), including implicit biases and jurors' perceptions of forensic evidence (the CSI Effect) (*Understand–Apply*)
3. Analyze empirical research on the effects of pre-trial publicity and media bias on juror impartiality and verdict outcomes in Canadian trials (*Analyze*)
4. Evaluate empirical evidence on the impact of popular crime dramas (CSI Effect) on juror expectations and trial fairness in Canada (*Evaluate*)
5. Assess psychological dynamics within jury deliberations, specifically group conformity pressures, stubbornness, and decision-making biases (*Analyze–Evaluate*)
6. Critically assess ethical and psychological challenges concerning juror privacy, digital exposure, and mental health prior to and during trials (*Evaluate–Create*)

Required Readings (4 readings, ~19 pages, ~1.5 hours @ 150 WPM.)

- ☐ Afilalo, N. (2018, July). Jury representation in Canada: Systemic barriers and biases in the “conscience of the community” (Preliminary report). Canadian Institute for the Administration of Justice.
https://ciaj-icaj.ca/wp-content/uploads/page/2019/02/r83_preliminary-report_jury-representation-in-canada.pdf
 - Read sections focused on representativeness and selection biases; ~5 pages.
- ☐ Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, ss. 629–640.
<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/page-102.html#h-128425>
 - (*Read in full regarding jury selection rules, challenges, and impartiality.*)

- Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. (2018). *Improving support for jurors in Canada: **Chapter 6**, Mental health and privacy*. House of Commons, Government of Canada.
<https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/421/JUST/Reports/RP9871696/justrp20/justrp20-e.pdf>
- Vidmar, N. (1996). "Pretrial Prejudice in Canada: A Comparative Perspective on the Criminal Jury." *Judicature*, 79(5), 249–255.
https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1865&context=faculty_scholarship

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Jury representation in Canada: Systemic barriers and biases in the “conscience of the community” (Afilalo, 2018; preliminary report)	LO1: Explains representativeness, source lists, and selection biases, helping you identify how jury pools are built and where impartiality risks arise.
Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, ss. 629–640 (Justice Laws Website)	LO1: Sets the legal rules for jury selection, challenge for cause (peremptories abolished), stand-aside, and impartiality, enabling you to locate and apply the governing provisions.
Improving support for jurors in Canada: Chapter 6 – Mental health and privacy (Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, 2018)	LO6: Identifies ethical and psychological challenges (privacy, digital exposure, mental health) and outlines supports, preparing you to assess safeguards before and during trials.
Pretrial Prejudice in Canada: A Comparative Perspective on the Criminal Jury (Vidmar, 1996)	LO3: Analyzes Canadian evidence and doctrine on pre-trial publicity and media bias, enabling you to assess their impact on juror impartiality and verdict outcomes.

Week 8's Optional Readings	How It Enriches Week 8 LOs
Cole, S. A., & Dioso-Villa, R. (2009). Investigating the “CSI Effect” effect: Media and litigation crisis in criminal law. <i>Stanford Law Review</i>, 61(6), 1335–1374. https://www.stanfordlawreview.org/print/article/investigating-the-csi-effect-effect-media-and-litigation-crisis-in-criminal-law/	LO2 & LO3: Rigorous analysis of the CSI effect narrative and media loops; helps students separate myth vs. evidence about juror demands for forensics.
Casavant, L., & Forget, C. (2022, December 9). <i>Legislative summary of Bill S-206: An Act to amend the Criminal Code (disclosure of information by jurors)</i> (Publication No. 44-1-S206-E). Library of Parliament. https://lop.parl.ca/staticfiles/PublicWebsite/Home/ResearchPublications/LegislativeSummaries/PDF/44-1/44-1-S206-E.pdf	LO5: Explains the new exception to jury-secrecy so jurors can speak to mental-health professionals—gold for ethics/privacy and juror well-being.

Week 9 – Eyewitnesses and Witness Memory

Learning Objectives

1. Explain key cognitive and psychological factors affecting eyewitness accuracy. (*Understand*)
2. Describe best practices for lineup construction and administration. (*Understand*)
3. Analyze causes of wrongful convictions linked to eyewitness misidentification. (*Analyze*)
4. Evaluate reforms such as lineup procedures and cautionary instructions using empirical evidence. (*Evaluate*)
5. Apply principles of memory and identification to critique a mock lineup protocol. (*Apply–Evaluate*)

Required Readings (3 readings, ~27 pages, ~2 hours @ 150 WPM.)

- ☐ Federal/Provincial/Territorial Heads of Prosecutions Subcommittee on the Prevention of Wrongful Convictions. (2018). *Chapter 3: Eyewitness identification and testimony*. In *Innocence at stake: The need for continued vigilance to prevent wrongful convictions in Canada* (Chapter 3, pp. 29–46). Public Prosecution Service of Canada. <https://www.ppsc-sppc.gc.ca/eng/pub/is-ip/ch3.html>
 - Estimator variables; System variables/Procedural safeguards; Cautionary instructions; Recommendations/Conclusions → ~6 printed pages
- ☐ Wells, G. L., Small, M., Penrod, S., Malpass, R. S., Fulero, S. M., & Brimacombe, C. A. E. (1998). Eyewitness identification procedures: Recommendations for lineups and photospreads. *Law and Human Behavior*, 22(6), 603–647. <https://web.williams.edu/wp-etc/psychology/Kassin/files/ET.whitepaper.pdf>
 - Assign: pp. 603–610 (core recommendations + rationale) → ~8 pages
- ☐ Wise, R. A., Sartori, G., Magnussen, S., & Safer, M. A. (2014). An examination of the causes and solutions to eyewitness error. *Frontiers in psychiatry*, 5, 102. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2014.00102>

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Federal/Provincial/Territorial Heads of Prosecutions Subcommittee on the Prevention of Wrongful Convictions. (2018).	LO1 — Explains estimator and system variables affecting eyewitness accuracy. LO3 — Analyzes wrongful conviction risks tied to eyewitness misidentification. LO4 — Evaluates reforms including procedural safeguards and cautionary instructions. LO5 — Applies guidelines to critique lineup protocols.
Wells, G. L., Small, M., Penrod, S., Malpass, R. S., Fulero, S. M., & Brimacombe, C. A. E. (1998). <i>Eyewitness identification procedures: Recommendations for lineups and photospreads</i> .	LO2 — Outlines best practices for lineup administration. LO4 — Evaluates lineup reforms and rationale using empirical recommendations. LO5 — Applies principles to critique lineup protocols.
Wise, R. A., Sartori, G., Magnussen, S., & Safer, M. A. (2014). <i>An examination of the causes and solutions to eyewitness error</i> .	LO1 — Explains psychological and cognitive factors affecting accuracy. LO3 — Analyzes causes of wrongful convictions tied to eyewitness error. LO4 — Evaluates proposed reforms to reduce eyewitness error.

Week 9's Optional Readings	Contribution to Week 9's LOs
Kaesler, M., Dunn, J. C., Ransom, K., & Semmler, C. (2020). Do sequential lineups impair underlying discriminability? <i>Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications</i> , 5, Article 35. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-020-00234-5	LO2 & LO4: Offers a nuanced evaluation of sequential lineup procedures, showing they may influence decision bias rather than accuracy—helps you critically assess reform proposals.

Week 10 – Experts on the Stand: Forensic Science & Bias

Learning Objectives

1. Describe common cognitive biases that can influence psychological and other forensic experts in Canadian legal proceedings, and explain their potential impact on judicial decision-making. (*Remember–Understand*)
2. Summarize Canadian findings and inquiries on the reliability and reform of expert evidence, including psychological testimony. (*Understand–Apply*)
3. Evaluate the Canadian legal standards for admissibility of expert evidence (*Mohan, Abbey*) and apply them to psychological reports and testimony in case-based scenarios. (*Analyze–Evaluate*)
4. Analyze sources of error in expert psychological work, including assessment/reporting mistakes, professional oversight mechanisms, and credentialing standards in Canada. (*Analyze–Evaluate*)
5. Critique expert psychological evidence for reliability, relevance, and bias, using Canadian legal criteria and empirical research. (*Evaluate–Create*)

Required Readings (2 readings, ~16 pages, ~1.5 hours @ 150 WPM.)

- ☐ Chin, J. M., Tomiska, J., & Li, C. (2017). Drawing the line between lay and expert opinion evidence. *McGill Law Journal*, 63(1), 89–131.
<https://lawjournal.mcgill.ca/article/drawing-the-line-between-lay-and-expert-opinion-evidence/>
 - Read pp. 93–99 (7 pages)
 - Read pp. 106–110 (5 pages)
 - Read pp. 125–126 (2 pages)
- ☐ R. v. *Mohan*, [1994] 2 S.C.R. 9 (SCC). <https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1131/index.do>
 - Read S.C.R. pp. 20–21 (2 pages)

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
R. v. Mohan, [1994] 2 S.C.R. 9 (SCC). https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1131/index.do - Read the section outlining the four-part admissibility test (relevance, necessity, absence of exclusionary rule, proper qualification).	LO3 — Establishes the Canadian four-part legal standard for admitting expert evidence, forming the legal foundation for evaluating psychological and other expert testimony.

Week 10's Optional Readings	Contribution to Week 10's LOs
Cuellar, M. (2025). The prosecutor's fallacy and expert testimony: A modern take using likelihood ratios. <i>arXiv</i> . https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.03217	LO3, LO5 — Explains probabilistic reasoning in expert testimony and how likelihood ratios can reduce reasoning errors in court.
Vredeveltdt, A., van Rosmalen, E. A. J., van Koppen, P. J., Dror, I. E., & Otgaar, H. (2024). Legal psychologists as experts: Guidelines for minimizing bias. <i>Psychology, Crime & Law</i> , 30(7), 705–729. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2022.2114476	LO1, LO4 — Proposes actionable guidelines for legal psychologists to reduce bias and improve reliability of expert testimony.

Week 11 – Mental Disorder & the Law: Fitness, NCRMD & Therapeutic Jurisprudence

Learning Objectives

1. Identify legal criteria for fitness to stand trial and NCRMD in Canada (Criminal Code s. 2, s. 16, and Part XX.1 procedures) (*Remember–Understand*)
2. Explain common mental disorders encountered in forensic assessments, focusing on how symptoms may relate to fitness and criminal responsibility (*Understand–Apply*)
3. Evaluate reliability, validity, and appropriate use/limits of leading forensic mental health tools (FIT-R, R-CRAS) (*Evaluate*)
4. Analyze therapeutic jurisprudence approaches in mental health courts and compare to Review Board dispositions (*Analyze–Evaluate*)

Required Readings (3 readings, ~17 pages total, ~1.5 hours @ 150 WPM.)

- Canadian Psychological Association. (2017, December). *Fitness to stand trial and criminal responsibility assessments in Canada: Improving access to qualified mental health professionals* (pp. 1–7).
<https://cpa.ca/docs/File/Position/Fitness%20to%20Stand%20Trial%20and%20Criminal%20Responsibility%20Assessments%20in%20Canada.pdf>

- Latimer, J., & Lawrence, A. (2006). *The review board systems in Canada: An overview of results from the Mentally Disordered Accused Data Collection Study*. Department of Justice Canada. https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/csj-sjc/jsp-sjp/rr06_1/rr06_1.pdf
 - Read Executive Summary, key statistics tables, and Conclusion only (~6 pages).
- Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. (2002, June). *Review of the mental disorder provisions of the Criminal Code* (Report No. 14, pp. **20–25**). House of Commons. <https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/committee/371/just/reports/rp1032130/justrp14/justrp14-e.pdf>

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Canadian Psychological Association. (2017). <i>Fitness to stand trial and criminal responsibility assessments in Canada</i> .	LO1 — Identifies Criminal Code criteria for fitness and NCRMD. LO2 — Explains how mental disorder symptoms relate to fitness and responsibility. LO3 — Introduces key forensic tools (FIT-R, R-CRAS) and their use/limits.
Latimer, J., & Lawrence, A. (2006). <i>The review board systems in Canada: An overview of results from the Mentally Disordered Accused Data Collection Study</i> .	LO4 — Analyzes how Review Boards operate and manage dispositions of NCRMD individuals.
Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. (2002). <i>Review of the mental disorder provisions of the Criminal Code</i> (Report No. 14). House of Commons.	LO1 — Identifies legislative framework for fitness and NCRMD. LO4 — Provides statutory context for Review Board processes and dispositions.

Week 12 – The Verdict: Decision-Making Under Doubt

Learning Objectives

1. Explain how judicial jury instructions define and communicate the standard of *beyond a reasonable doubt* to jurors. (*Remember–Understand*)
2. Analyze the influence of heuristics, persuasive strategies, and moral reasoning on jury deliberation outcomes. (*Analyze*)
3. Evaluate the impact of procedural safeguards (e.g., unanimous verdict requirements, deliberation rules) on juror decision-making. (*Evaluate*)

4. Reflect on the challenges of reaching a fair and impartial verdict under conditions of uncertainty and conflicting evidence. (*Evaluate–Create*)

Required Readings (5 Readings, ~32 pages total, ~2 hours @ 150 WPM.)

- ☐ Burghardt, K., Rand, W., & Girvan, M. (2017). Evidence of herding and stubbornness in jury deliberations. *arXiv*.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1710.11180>
 - Read pp. 1–8.
- ☐ Burghardt, K., Rand, W., & Girvan, M. (2019). Inferring models of opinion dynamics from aggregated jury data. *PLOS ONE*, 14(6), e0218312.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0218312>
 - • Read pp. 1–10 (~10 pages).
- ☐ Canadian Judicial Council, National Committee on Jury Instructions. (n.d.). 11.24 Eyewitness identification evidence. In *Model jury instructions* (C. Final instructions). National Judicial Institute. <https://www.nji-inm.ca/index.cfm/publications/model-jury-instructions/?langSwitch=en>
- ☐ Hans, V. P. (1979). *The unanimity requirement: Issues and evidence*. In *Studies on the jury* (pp. 141–182). Law Reform Commission of Canada.
<https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/62650NCJRS.pdf>
 - Read pp. 149–156 only (~7 pages).
- ☐ Supreme Court of Canada. (1997). *R. v. Lifchus*, [1997] 3 S.C.R. 320. <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1543/index.do>
 - • Read paras. 36–39 only (~2 pages).

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Burghardt, K., Rand, W., & Girvan, M. (2017). <i>Evidence of herding and stubbornness in jury deliberations</i> .	L02 — Analyzes influence dynamics such as herding and resistance to opinion change in jury deliberations.
Burghardt, K., Rand, W., & Girvan, M. (2019). <i>Inferring models of opinion dynamics from aggregated jury data</i> . <i>PLOS ONE</i> , 14(6), e0218312.	L02 — Examines model-based patterns of deliberation, timing, and influence mechanisms.
Canadian Judicial Council, National Committee on Jury Instructions. (n.d.). 11.24 <i>Eyewitness identification evidence</i> . In <i>Model jury instructions (C. Final instructions)</i> . National Judicial Institute.	L03 — Illustrates how standardized instructions function as procedural safeguards against wrongful convictions.
Hans, V. P. (1979). <i>The unanimity requirement: Issues and evidence</i> . In <i>Studies on the jury</i> (pp. 141–182). Law Reform Commission of Canada.	L03 — Evaluates the impact of unanimity as a procedural safeguard on deliberation quality and fairness.
Supreme Court of Canada. (1997). <i>R. v. Lifchus</i> , [1997] 3 S.C.R. 320.	L01 — Frames the standard of “beyond a reasonable doubt” and how it should be conveyed in jury instructions.

Week 12's Optional Readings	Contribution to Week 12's LOs
Diamond, S. S., & Rose, M. R. (2005). Real juries. <i>Annual Review of Law and Social Science</i> , 1, 255–284. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.1.041604.120002	LO3, LO4 — Provides real-world insights into how jury instructions and safeguards operate in practice.

Week 13 – Sentencing & Risk: Justice After the Verdict**Learning Objectives**

1. Summarize the purposes and guiding principles of sentencing in Canada, as outlined in s. 718 of the *Criminal Code*, and explain their relationship to proportionality and restraint. (*Remember–Understand*)
2. Explain how *Gladue* principles and other sentencing considerations for Indigenous peoples are applied in the post-conviction context, including their statutory and case law foundations. (*Understand–Apply*)
3. Describe the structure, scoring, and intended use of selected risk assessment tools (e.g., Static-99R, VRS-SO) in sentencing and release decision-making. (*Remember–Understand*)
4. Critique the empirical support, cultural bias concerns, and predictive limitations of commonly used risk tools in Canadian sentencing and corrections. (*Analyze–Evaluate*)
5. Reflect on the balance between reintegration, justice, and public safety when recommending or evaluating sentencing and release outcomes. (*Evaluate–Create*)

Required Readings (6 readings, ~29 pages total, ~2 hours @ 150 WPM.)

- ☐ Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 16(1), 39–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018362>
http://static.nicic.gov.s3.amazonaws.com/info.nicic.gov/files/media/file/02-RehabilitatingCriminalJustice_Andrews.pdf
 - Read pp. 39–48 only.
- ☐ Criminal Code, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46, ss. 718–718.2. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-718.html> ; <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-718.2.html>
 - Read ss. 718–718.2 only.
- ☐ Department of Justice Canada. (2017). *Spotlight on Gladue: Challenges, experiences, and possibilities in Canada’s criminal justice system* (Report).
https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2018/jus/J4-46-2017-eng.pdf
 - Read pp. 12–17 only.
- ☐ Department of Justice Canada. (2025, March 10). *Canada’s first-ever federal Indigenous Justice Strategy to address systemic discrimination and*

overrepresentation in the Canadian justice system (News release).

<https://www.canada.ca/en/departement-justice/news/2025/03/canadas-first-federal-indigenous-justice-strategy-to-address-systemic-discrimination-and-overrepresentation-in-the-canadian-justice-system.html>

- Parole Board of Canada. (2021). *Decision-making policy manual for Board members* (2nd ed., No. 20). https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/pbc-clcc/documents/manual-manuel/Decision-Making_Policy_Manual-2nd_Ed._No-20_%282021-10-20%29.pdf
 - Read pp. 20–25 only.
- Public Safety Canada. (2017). *Research summary — What we know and don't know about risk assessment with offenders of Indigenous heritage* (2017–S009). <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/2017-s009/index-en.aspx>

Required Reading	Learning Objectives Addressed
Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. <i>Psychology, Public Policy, and Law</i> ,	L02, L04 — You use the Risk-Need-Responsivity framework to explain how assessed risk/needs shape sentencing, parole, and rehabilitation, and you critique its implications for equity.
Criminal Code, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46, ss. 718–718.2.	L01, L03 — You identify sentencing purposes/principles and apply s. 718.2(e) (Gladue) when considering post-verdict decisions for Indigenous persons.
Department of Justice Canada. (2017). <i>Spotlight on Gladue: Challenges, experiences, and possibilities in Canada’s criminal justice system</i> (Report).	L03 — You explain how Gladue principles operate in practice and the challenges that affect fair, culturally informed sentencing.
Department of Justice Canada. (2025, March 10). <i>Canada’s first-ever federal Indigenous Justice Strategy to address systemic discrimination and overrepresentation in the Canadian justice system</i> (News release).	L03, L04 — You connect current federal policy reforms to sentencing and correctional outcomes, situating Gladue within broader systemic change.
Parole Board of Canada. (2021). <i>Decision-making policy manual for Board members</i> (2nd ed., No. 20).	L01, L02 — You describe how Board members weigh risk, need, and public safety criteria, and you analyze how these criteria interact with evidence-based models like RNR.
Public Safety Canada. (2017). <i>Research summary — What we know and don’t know about risk assessment with offenders of Indigenous heritage</i> (2017–S009).	L02, L03 — You assess limits and considerations when applying risk tools with Indigenous individuals and integrate those considerations into sentencing/parole recommendations.

Week 13's Optional Readings	Contribution to Week 13's LOs.
Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2007). <i>Risk-need-responsivity model for offender assessment and rehabilitation</i> (Corrections Research User Report 2007-06). Public Safety Canada. https://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/9.563109/publication.html	LO2, LO1 — You connect the RNR principles to decisions about intensity of supervision, programming, and case planning after conviction.
Danziger, S., Levav, J., & Avnaim-Pesso, L. (2011). Extraneous factors in judicial decisions. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i>, 108(17), 6889–6892. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1018033108	LO4 — You examine how non-legal factors (e.g., time-of-day) can bias release decisions, informing critical reflection on sentencing/parole discretion.