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SAMPLE SYLLABUS OF RECORD

I. Catalogue Description
PHIL 110: Reasoning and the Law
Hour Designation: 3c-0l-3cr
Credits: 3.0
Emphasizes development of critical thinking in the context of legal reasoning. Students are exposed to issues in the Law, and to modes of reasoning required in that domain and others. Application of principles and methods to detailed analysis of well-known judicial cases.

College: College of Humanities/Soc Sci
Department: Philosophy
Pre-requisites: None

II. Course Objectives
At the end of the course students will be able to:
A. Recognize, analyze, and evaluate arguments.
B. Understand the nature of legal reasoning.
C. Analyze relevant legal concepts and arguments in a careful, sustained manner.
D. Demonstrate analytical and synthesis techniques.

III. Detailed Course Outline
Week 1-2: Statements and Arguments
Words, Meaning, and Definition (R&L Ch. 1.1-1.2)
Sentences, Language Uses, and Truth (R&L Ch. 1.3)
The Nature of Arguments (R&L Ch. 2.1-2.2)

Week 3-5: Deduction, Induction, and Reasoning in Law
Deductive vs. Inductive Reasoning; Deduction and Validity (R&L Ch. 2.3-2.4)
Inductive Reasoning and Methods of Appraising Strength (R&L Ch. 2.5)
Deductive Reasoning and the Law (R&L Ch. 3.1-3.2)
Inductive Reasoning and the Law (R&L Ch. 3.3)

Week 6: How Judges Reason
Reasoning from Statutory Rules (R&L Ch. 3.4.1)
Reasoning from Cases; The Nature and Legitimacy of Judicial Adjudication (R&L Ch. 3.4)

Week 7: Case Analysis
The Written Opinion (R&L Ch. 4)
Analysis of Riggs v. Palmer and Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad (R&L Ch. 5)

Week 8: Battered Woman's Defense
"Justification and Excuse" (PPL, 406-410)
State v. Leidholm (PPL, 421-423)
Catheryn Rosen "The Battered Woman's Defense" (PPL, 421-430)
Week 9: Insanity Defense
"Justification and Excuse" (PPL, 411-413)
State v. Cameron (PPL, 430-433)
Norval Morris "The Abolition of the Insanity Defense" (PPL, 433-436)
Stephen Morse "Excusing the Crazy: The Insanity Defense Reconsidered" (PPL, 437-439)

Week 10: Obscenity and Pornography
"Obscenity and Pornography" (PPL, 230-233)
American Booksellers Association v. Hudnut (PPL, 237-241)
Joel Feinberg "Obscenity as Pornography" (PPL, 241-247)
Catherin MacKinnon "Pornography: On Morality and Politics" (PPL, 248-253)

Week 11: Capital Punishment
"The Death Penalty" (PPL, 466-471)
Atkins v. Virginia (PPL, 471-476)
McCleskey v. Kemp (PPL, 490-493)
Randall Kennedy "Homicide, Race, and Capital Punishment" (PPL, 494-500)
Ernest van den Haag "The Death Penalty Once More" (PPL, 476-482)
H.A. Bedau "A Reply to van den Haag" (PPL, 482-489)

Week 12: Privacy
"Legal Reasoning and Constitutional Interpretation" (PPL, 165-172, especially 168ff.)
Griswold v. Connecticut (PPL, 254-259) OR Lawrence et al. v. Texas (PPL, 259-265)
Robert Bork "The Right of Privacy" (PPL, 188-189)
Antonin Scalia "The Role of U.S. Federal Courts in Interpreting the Constitution" (PPL, 178-184)

Week 13: Affirmative Action
"Equal Protection Law, Racial Discrimination, and Affirmative Action" (PPL, 277-284)
Barbara Grutter v. Lee Bollinger et al. (PPL, 284-292)
Peter Westen "Puzzles About Equality" (PPL, 293-295)
Naomi Zack "What is Race?" (PPL, 295-300)
Thomas Nagel "A Defense of Affirmative Action" (PPL, 300-303)
Shelby Steele "Affirmative Action" (PPL, 303-308)

Week 14: Same-Sex Marriage
"Introduction" (PPL, 314-319)
Baehr v. Lewin (PPL, 319-322)
Cass Sunstein "Homosexuality and the Constitution" (PPL, 322-326)

Exam 3 will take place during the final exam period.
IV. Evaluation Methods:
Evaluation methods may vary. The following is a sample Evaluation Method:
Three in-class examinations will test students' ability to locate and analyze arguments in a text, differentiate between different kinds of arguments (e.g. deductive, inductive, abductive) and their use in legal contexts, and recognize and evaluate the legal reasoning in well known judicial cases. Examinations will be combination of true/false, multiple choice, and short answer questions. Assessment for the course breaks down as follows:
Exam 1: 30%
Exam 2: 30%
Exam 3: 30%
Class Participation: 10% (Class participation will be measured primarily by attendance, but also by actively listening and engaging in class discussions; students will be provided with clear guidelines about this at the start of the semester.)

V. Example Grading Scale
90-100% A, 80-89% B, 70-79% C, 60-69% D, 59% or less F.

VI. Undergraduate Course Attendance Policy
It is expected that students will attend every scheduled class. Particulars for penalizing missed classes will be left to individual instructors. (See undergraduate catalog for Undergraduate Course Attendance Policy.)

VII. Required Textbooks, Supplemental Books and Readings.
Required texts will vary by semester according to instructor preference. The above syllabus is based on the following texts:

VIII. Special Resource Requirements: None.

IX. Bibliography

**COURSE ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE**

**A. Details of the Course.**
A1. The course will be open to all IUP students.
A2. This course does not require changes in any existing Philosophy department courses.
A3. This course has not been offered on a trial basis.
A4. This is not a dual-level course.
A5. This course may not be taken for variable credit.
A6. Institutions that offer similar courses include:
   - Union College: Reasoning and the Law
   - SUNY Geneseo: Reasoning and the Law
   - University of Northern Colorado: The Nature of Legal Reasoning
A7. This specific course is not required by the American Philosophical Association.

**B. Interdisciplinary Implications.**
B1. This course will be taught by one instructor.
B2. This course does not duplicate or affect courses offered by other departments.
B3. This course will not be cross-listed.
B4. This course will be made available to Continuing Education students.

**C. Implementation.**
C1. The department can work this course into its rotation of courses.
C2. No additional space, equipment, supplies, or library materials are needed.
C3. None of the resources for this course is based on a grant.
C4. The course will be offered once a year.
C5. We expect to offer two sections each semester the course is offered.
C6. Forty-two students is the present enrollment we set for lower-level classes.
C7. The American Philosophical Association does not recommend maximum enrollments for this type of course.
C8. This is not a distance education course.

**D. Miscellaneous.**
None