

REDESIGNING PRISONS

The Final Draft (25% of Total Grade): Due Week 15

Make sure you completely fill out *all* the information in the sections below. Failure to complete these sections fully and honestly may incur a loss of points. Responding to some questions with “no” or “n/a” or “I don’t know yet” *is* acceptable; however, leaving any responses blank is not. If you do not understand any questions you are encouraged to contact your instructor.

Section 1

Name: Yara Soliman

Your Major: Architecture

Section 2

On a scale of 1 to 10, how confident are you *now* feeling about writing for this course?

1/ 9/10. I really feel like I have learned a lot in this course and truly improved my writing. I have walked out of writing classes feeling like I have written good papers, but not necessarily learning something new. I am trying my best in this paper to compile all the things I have learned and to make you proud :) I do not think I would have ever thought of submitting my writing to a journal before this course, and now I am really looking forward to it at the end of the semester.

Commented [PMM1]: Already so very proud of you

BY THE WAY ... what about those pictures?
nice summer job for you – I can pay 😊
seriously!

Commented [PMM2]: 😊

Section 3

Final grade you received from your previous assignment (Working Draft):

1/ 100/100 (thank you)

REDESIGNING PRISONS

Section 4

Based on your last assignment and the lessons you have received so far in ENG 204, what **three** things have you given extra care and attention towards for this assignment?

1/ Bridging topic openers. This is a comment I have received a lot in my working draft, so I will be giving extra care and attention to fix these issues.

2/ Repetition. Something I had to work on a lot based on my previous feedback is the repetition of words and bridging sentences, so I am giving extra care towards this.

3/ Paragraph organisation. I am constantly trying to remain aware of my paragraph purposes and the function behind every sentence as I am writing. A big lesson I have learned,

Commented [PMM3]: Bless your heart 😊

REDESIGNING PRISONS

Checklist

Before submitting, make sure that you can write “YES” for each of the items below.

1/ I understand that if I write “YES” to any of these statements then such a response is completely true. I further understand that if there is evidence that I have not responded accurately then my paper will be returned to me ungraded. In such a case, I will have to correct my paper and resubmit it. In so doing, I will be subject to a “late penalty.” YES

2/ I have accurately and fully completed an Auto-Peer review of my paper. YES

3/ I have named the file for submission as follows: Working Draft [my iLearn name]

For example: Final Draft Philip Michael McCarthy. YES

4/ The file I am submitting is a Microsoft Word document. YES

5/ I have read the rubric and all relevant course material, and included all the information required. YES

6/ I have changed the header of this paper to the ALL CAPS title of my paper. YES

7/ I have pressed spellcheck/grammar check and corrected any text as appropriate. YES

8/ I have carefully read *out loud* my entire paper and corrected issues where appropriate. YES

9/ I have carefully checked my paper to ensure there are *no* examples of any form of plagiarism. I fully understand what these forms of plagiarism are and I realize fully that any

REDESIGNING PRISONS

examples of plagiarism will have severe consequences (including *but not limited to* a zero grade, an F for the course, a formal report to administration, and/or having to write a completely new research paper on a different topic). I further confirm that I have had ample opportunity to discuss issues of plagiarism with my instructor and that any and all of my questions have been addressed. YES

10/ All work submitted in this paper is my own. No other person was involved in any of the actual writing of this paper. YES

Write Your Paper Below

Begin your paper at the *start of the next page*. Note that APA Level 1 and Level 2 headers have *not* been provided for you: You are now required to complete these yourself. Complete the paper using appropriate paragraphs. Remember to leave the rubric at the end of the paper.

REDESIGNING PRISONS

Abstract

In this paper, I argue that prisons should be redesigned as a form of punishment. The term *punishment* denotes the combination of four prison goals: retribution, deterrence, incapacitation, and rehabilitation. I support my position with four arguments reflecting the four prison goals. First, *retribution* offers a moral response to the victims and offenders. Second, *deterrence* aims to prevent people from initially offending. Third, *incapacitation* guards society from future harm. Finally, *rehabilitation* responds to the offenders compassionately and sympathetically. I also consider the alternative argument that prisons should be redesigned as a form of rehabilitation. While this argument has merit, I analyze reasons why this system is not as effective as critics may believe. This paper is important because incarceration rates and recidivism rates remain high in most countries. Thus, governments must reconsider their current prison systems and enforce more effective measures. I argue that the most effective measure is punishment.

Keywords: Prison design, retribution, deterrence, incapacitation, rehabilitation, punishment

Commented [PMM4]: This is the Final Paper. As such, there is likely to be significantly fewer comments because Well ... no more updates, right? 😊 That said ... I'll probably end up highlighting some stuff in yellow Because ... that's what I do. 😊

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Commented [PMM5]: Italics can be used to introduce a new term
Can be useful

Formatted: Font: Italic

REDESIGNING PRISONS

Redesigning Prisons

Prisons have four main goals: retribution, deterrence, incapacitation, and rehabilitation. Over the years, various countries have begun to focus on the four goals individually rather than collectively. For example, Scandinavian countries emphasize the goal of rehabilitation (Smith, 2012), while Russia emphasizes ~~on~~ the goal of deterrence (Slade, 2018). However, in this paper I argue that prisons should be designed as a combination of the four main goals. More specifically, I define this combination as *punishment* (Kifer et al., 2013; Sutton, 2020).

I support my position with four arguments following the four main goals. First, I argue that retribution allows prisoners to repent. This repentance benefits the prisoners as well as their victims (Ward & Salmon, 2009). Second, I argue that prisons should be designed to deter citizens. Such a design would deter citizens as it is a fear-inducing mechanism preventing people from breaking the law (Gromet & Darley, 2019). Third, I argue that incapacitation protects the general public. Removing offenders from the general public reduces the offenders' abilities to commit further crimes and potentially harm more citizens (Sutton, 2020). Finally, I argue that rehabilitation is necessary for the public welfare. Changing the criminals' habits protects the public while also restoring the criminals' stability (McNeill, 2012).

I also consider alternative positions towards the design of prison systems. First, critics argue that prisons designed as a form of punishment may be too harsh on prisoners' mental and emotional states (Djurichkovic, 2011). Second, some critics identify that Scandinavian countries following the rehabilitation model have obtained the lowest recidivism rates in the world (Riep, 2019). While these positions have merit, I examine reasons why they may be misleading. For example, I respond to the second position by revealing that Scandinavian countries continue to rank high in happiness on the World Happiness Report (Thomson, 2016). Therefore, Scandinavian countries are expected to have a lower recidivism rate regardless of the prison system they follow.

REDESIGNING PRISONS

This paper is important because prisons as an institution or as a concept are present in all communities. Thus, it is important to establish and agree on the way in which the prisons are designed. If prisons are to continue without integrating punishment as the prison system, countries may find it increasingly difficult to pinpoint the reasons for their rising crime and recidivism rates. Incorporating all four aspects would improve the livelihood and the economy of the society.

Prisons as a Form of Punishment

Punishment, as previously defined, is the combination of the four prison rationales: retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, and rehabilitation. This definition has been agreed upon by several authors (e.g., Djurichkovic, 2011; Kifer et al., 2013; Sutton, 2020). In addition to being labeled as the main prison goals, they are often referred to as the main punishment goals. Therefore, prisons and punishment may be **unanimous**.

Commented [PMM6]: You mean "synonymous" ?

Retribution

Retribution is the first and oldest of the four principles of prison design. According to Sutton (2020), the principle was first inscribed in the Code of Hammurabi, the earliest and best-preserved set of laws. Additionally, the word 'penitentiary,' a synonym for prison, comes from the Latin word 'paenitentia,' meaning 'repentance' (Fulkerson, 2006). Thus, retribution refers to the idea that offenders should be subjected to a measured response to pay, or repent, for their offenses.

Retribution is a morally and ethically necessary component. Ward and Salmon (2009) argue that failure to subject the offenders would imply that the offense committed was insignificant and undeserving of a response. In return, this failure to hold offenders accountable implies that the consequent victims' reactions are likewise insignificant and undeserving of a response (Miller, 2009). Therefore, retribution will respond to victims in ways that would comfort and validate their emotions, restoring moral equality.

In addition to offering a proper response to the victims, retribution also offers a proper response to the offenders. As examined by Ward and Salmon (2009), retribution helps in

REDESIGNING PRISONS

recognizing the prisoners' responsibility for their actions. The authors argue that failure to allow the offenders to retribute would entail that the offenders are viewed as too morally and intellectually impaired to understand their crimes. Therefore, to avoid undermining and belittling the offenders' moral agency, the offenders have the right to retribution (Bennet, 2008; Duff, 2002).

The impact of retribution is exhibited not only at an individual scale, but at a community level as well. In a scientific study by two professors from Princeton University, Gromet and Darley (2009) examined how people seek justice for an offense. The authors suggest that even if we have not been directly harmed by the offender, we still desire the sense of justice that is achieved through inflicting retributive punishments on the offender. The results of their study suggest that people prioritize empathizing with the victims, regardless of the severity of the crime. The authors' results also indicate that seeking punishment for the offender was the participants' main objective. This objective fulfilled what the participants interpreted as justice for the crimes, a result consistent with previous studies conducted. Thus, retribution is a necessary component to a successful prison design at a victim, offender, and community scale.

Deterrence and Incapacitation

Deterrence and Incapacitation are two other vital principles to a successful prison design. Whereas retribution and rehabilitation may focus at an individual scale, deterrence and incapacitation can focus at a larger societal scale. Furthermore, the implementation of incapacitation directly results in the implementation of deterrence.

Deterrence prevents future crime. According to Gromet and Darley (2009), deterrence is the utilitarian view that imprisonment discourages individuals and the public from future offenses. Unlike the other four principles of prison design, deterrence can occur before the conviction, since it aims to prevent the conviction in the first place.

The prevention of conviction can appear in two forms. The first form is increasing the certainty of conviction (Wright, 2010). For example, increasing the number of surveillance

REDESIGNING PRISONS

cameras at a bank would decrease the likelihood of committing crimes. The second form of deterrence of crime is through increasing the severity of the conviction (Wright, 2010). For example, increasing the minimum prison sentence of a crime from five years to eight years. As such, deterrence serves as a warning to future offenders, hoping that the risk of going to prison, or the likelihood of getting caught, would prevent them from committing crimes.

The risk of incapacitation allows deterrence to serve as a warning. Incapacitation refers to the removal of offenders from society in order to protect the public and avoid possibilities for future offenses (Sutton, 2020). In the 1970s, when incapacitation was first recognized as a prison rationale, a study was published by Wolfgang and colleagues (1972) that is still highly regarded today. The study suggests that a small number of people are responsible for a large number of crimes (Wright, 2010). As a result, incapacitating these felons would decrease the crime rates. Following this study, the concept of removing criminals from society has been implemented in most prisons across the world.

Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation is the final essential goal for a successful prison design. According to McNeill (2012), the purpose of rehabilitation can be considered in two ways: a utilitarian and a deontological interpretation.

The utilitarian interpretation views that the purpose of rehabilitation is to maximize public welfare by changing the offender's habits. Accordingly, the main goal is to reduce harm to the society, and if that is also in the offender's best interests then that is an afterthought. In contrast, McNeill suggests that the deontological interpretation seeks the offender's best interests as the main goal. This goal allows for the offender to restore their rights and stability. As such, both interpretations of rehabilitation would ultimately lead to a better prison design, whether as a community or an individual.

Rehabilitation may be achieved in many forms. These forms may include psychotherapy, counseling, education, or even creative therapy. Djurichkovic (2011) argues

REDESIGNING PRISONS

that education is vital for prisoners to prosper, and to strengthen their stability and opportunities beyond prison. These benefits directly correspond to the goals of rehabilitation.

The Rehabilitation Model of Prisons

Rehabilitation as an independent prison goal has recently been enforced by some countries. This prison goal can mostly be found in Scandinavian countries, where the prisons are commonly known as open prisons (Smith, 2012). This title is attributed to the countries' liberal system of imprisonment. The focus on only rehabilitation as a goal causes not only a **neglect**, but a contradiction of the other goals of incapacitation, deterrence, and retribution.

Commented [PMM7]: Odd word?

Incapacitation

Incapacitation is **overlooked** in Scandinavian prisons. For example, in Jyderup, Denmark, there is no prison gate. Instead, the gateway is simply a threshold that can be crossed, with no physical barriers preventing someone from exiting the prison (Smith, 2012). The very little security preventing prisoners from escaping interferes with the goal and definition of incapacitation. Furthermore, incapacitation is also aimed at protecting the public (Sutton, 2020). The lack of a barricade, at minimum, between potential serial killers and an average passer-by should be alarming. If there is nothing preventing a prisoner from escaping, the prisoners are not truly serving time.

Commented [PMM8]: Implies they forgot about it?

In addition to Scandinavian prisons being easy to exit, they are also easy to enter. The Jyderup prison grounds function fully as visiting areas (Smith, 2012), where families of the prisoners can visit in the lawn or the church. Kothari (2009), a UN Special Rapporteur on torture, visited Danish prisons in 2008. The reporter suggested that the prisons in Denmark mirror life outside of prison as accurately as possible. This information further demonstrates how incapacitation is overlooked in Scandinavian prisons.

Deterrence

Scandinavian prisons do not prevent future crimes. More specifically, they do not prevent future crimes as they do not incorporate deterrence into their prison system. As

REDESIGNING PRISONS

previously defined, deterrence's objective is that the risk of going to prison is enough to stop people from committing felonies (Wright, 2010). The lack of incapacitation in rehabilitation-based prisons blurs the line between inmate and civilian. Additionally, the guards in prison do not carry defensive weapons, such as batons, tasers, handcuffs, or pepper spray (Larson, 2013). This lack of equipment is less than what an average police officer on the street is equipped with. Thus, people are not discouraged from committing a felony.

In addition to the lack of discouragement, people could potentially be persuaded into committing a felony. The amenities provided in the Scandinavian prisons allow for better living conditions for prisoners than what some people may possess outside of the prison. For example, Larson (2013) reports that prison rooms have flat-screen TVs, audio systems, and mini-refrigerators. Additionally, all Scandinavian prisons have a self-catering system. Originated in the 1970s in Denmark, this system allows all prisoners to grocery shop and use the kitchen facilities and utensils, including large knives, to cook for themselves (Smith, 2012). Thus, criminals are allowed to sit in a prison that is unbarred, with guards that are unequipped, while watching TV and eating food they have cooked, all for free. Not all citizens of Scandinavian countries can say the same, even though the author reports the countries have one of the lowest poverty and homelessness rates. Evidently, criminals are offered better lifestyles than many citizens through this system.

The Scandinavian prison system is not feasible elsewhere. For example, if the rehabilitation-focused model was adapted in the United States, it would tempt people into committing crimes, rather than deter them. Scandinavian countries have better living conditions than most countries (Thomsen, 2016). Therefore, the issue of potentially persuading people to commit felonies to achieve better lifestyle conditions may not be as prevalent there. However, in a country such as the United States, this potential of persuasion is extremely possible. The United States poverty rate in 2020 was 11.4%, with over 580,000 people experiencing homelessness (Shrider et al., 2021). In comparison, the poverty rate in Sweden is 6% (Riep, 2019), almost half of the United States' poverty rate. Thus, it is safe to

REDESIGNING PRISONS

suggest that people may be persuaded into committing crimes to be provided with not only shelter, but a well-stocked kitchen, pool and table-tennis tables, and aquariums (Larson, 2013). As such, the Rehabilitation-based system not only neglects deterrence, but achieves the opposite.

Retribution

The rehabilitation model of prisons does not provide criminals with retribution. More specifically, retribution is not achieved since neither incapacitation nor deterrence are achieved. Thus, the criminals cannot truly feel remorse for their actions through only rehabilitation. According to Miller (2009), an offender undergoing rehabilitation is not identical to that offender assuming responsibility. This responsibility refers to the offender's accountability for their crimes, as well as the offender's moral responsibility for their victims.

As previously stated, the implementation of retribution has benefits on the offender, victim, and community. At an offender-level, rehabilitation-focused prisons offer the offender immediate exoneration rather than allowing them to earn their redemption. At a victim-level, rehabilitating the offender undermines the victim's right to justice. Finally, at a community-level, if the prisoner did not feel remorse for their actions through retribution, the community would feel that justice was not achieved (Gromet & Darley, 2009).

Is Rehabilitation Really the Answer?

Some may argue that the Rehabilitation-focused system of imprisonment is ideal for the prisoners. Critics believe that enforcing punishment as a prison system may be too harsh on the prisoners' mental and emotional states (Djurichkovic, 2011). Therefore, critics favor a Rehabilitation-focused prison system. This prison system is lenient and allows the offender to enjoy life as close to being outside of prison as possible (Kothari, 2009; Smith, 2012).

This position that punishment may be too harsh on the prisoners' states has merit. The position takes an empathetic stance to the offenders, which is an important trait to have in order to prosper as a society. Certainly, we can acknowledge that the possible infliction of harm to prisoners' mental and emotional states after implementing punishment is not a good

Commented [PMM9]: ?

REDESIGNING PRISONS

outcome. Still, it is also important to provide the same empathetic stance to the victims, not only the offenders. As Ward and Salmon (2009) suggest, the possible inflicted harm on some offenders is outweighed by the definitive reduction of harm to all victims, potential victims, and overall population. Treating the offenders empathetically results in treating the victims, existing or future, unempathetically. Therefore, I argue that the overall benefit of society outweighs the benefit of one criminal.

~~Further critics~~ Critics may further argue that the rehabilitation-focused prisons are effective. This argument considers that the Scandinavian countries adopting this system have the lowest recidivism rate in the world of 20%. The United States, in contrast, has a recidivism rate of 70% (Deady, 2014). Thus, critics conclude that implementing this prison structure would also decrease other countries' recidivism rates.

Although this conclusion is a fair assumption, there are three major issues with the argument. The first issue is the assumption that the low recidivism rates of the Scandinavian countries tie back to the type of prison system implemented. In Thomsen (2016), the author explores the Nordic countries' framework on governance. Thomsen found that the countries continue to rank high in terms of social welfare and income equality, while ranking first in perceived happiness. Furthermore, the Nordic countries have an average ranking of 3.6 whereas other countries have an average of 106.1 on the Rule of Law governance indicator. Rule of Law is defined by the author as the extent to which all citizens abide by the law and the likelihood of crime and violence. Thus, the data suggests that there is a very high quality of life overall and very low crime rates. It is safe to assume that the low recidivism rates are as a result of the high quality of life that the Scandinavian countries present, and may not be because of the prison system.

The second issue in the critics' argument is recidivism as a measuring tool. In addition to the inaccurate attribution of a low recidivism rate to a country's prison system, recidivism overall is a flawed way of measuring the effectiveness of rehabilitation. McNeill (2012), a Professor of Criminology at the University of Glasgow, argues that the reason

REDESIGNING PRISONS

recidivism is flawed is because it measures the likelihood of a series of social reactions occurring. The social reactions are that a criminal was caught reoffending, reported by the witness, detected by the police, and then sentenced by a judge or jury. Thus, recidivism relies solely on a chain of people and does not measure a change of behavior of a person. McNeill compares using recidivism as a tool of measurement to be as effective as using re-hospitalization as a tool of measurement. For instance, whether the success of a treatment depended on if the patient returns to the doctor again. As follows, the absence of reconviction does not mean the success of treatment. Furthermore, to extend the analogy, the author indicates that similar to how a patient could be re-hospitalized for a different injury, a felon could be reconvicted for a different felony. Therefore, recidivism is overall a defective and inadequate measure of effectiveness.

The final issue with the critics' argument is the economic feasibility of the rehabilitation-focused prison design. Assuming a rehabilitation-focused prison is successful, it would remain difficult to implement in other countries because of the funding required. Scandinavian countries spend around \$93,000 per prisoner per year in order to maintain their system. In comparison, the United States, for example, spends \$31,000 (Sharma, 2015). Therefore, in order to implement the rehabilitation-based system, the United States would need to triple their budget per prisoner. Additionally, as Larson (2013) reports, the United States has the highest incarceration rates in the world. By contrast, the author reports that Scandinavian countries have one of the lowest. This record increases the infeasibility. Furthermore, increasing the budget for the United States prisons would most likely mean an increase in citizen taxes. This taxation raises the question of why citizens should spend more of their hard-earned money to benefit the offenders of society. Evidently, there are many economic setbacks that suggest the infeasibility of implementing the rehabilitation-focused prison design, if we were to consider it a successful system.

Conclusion

Commented [PMM10]: ?

"It follows"?

REDESIGNING PRISONS

There are many benefits to incorporating all four prison goals together. First, retribution provides moral validation to the victims, acknowledgment of responsibility to the offenders, and restoration of justice to the community. Second, deterrence encompasses that the possibility of going to prison, or the likelihood of getting caught, may prevent people from offending. Third, removing offenders from society protects future victims, and decreases crime rates. Finally, rehabilitation restores the offender's rights and stability, and reduces the harm caused to the society.

Despite the many benefits of punishment as a prison design, critics argue that rehabilitation-focused prisons may be more effective. First, critics believe that rehabilitation-focused prisons are less harsh on prisoners' mental and emotional state. This belief has merit since it acknowledges the offenders' wellbeing. However, it is more important to acknowledge the victim and society's wellbeing by seeking justice from the offender. Second, critics argue that countries with rehabilitation-focused prisons, such as Scandinavian prisons, have the lowest recidivism rates and are thus proven to be more effective. However, Scandinavian countries have a lower crime rate overall, and so it is expected to also have lower recidivism rates overall. Furthermore, using recidivism rates as a tool for measuring effectiveness is flawed, as it only measures whether the criminal has been reconvicted, not whether the criminal's behavior has been changed.

Prison as a theory has been implemented since the birth of modern civilization in first millennia BC. Although prisons have been in existence for so long, most countries are still struggling with high incarceration and recidivism rates. This reality means that the current systems of prison design are not effective enough. Therefore, it is important for governments to replace and implement a better strategy: In this paper, I argued that this better strategy is for prisons to be designed as a form of punishment.

Commented [PMM11]: <https://www.asrarijournal.com/submit>

Submit the paper there by 5pm Monday, May 30th 😊
You've been amazing 😊

And yes ... you did persuade me 😊

References

- Bennett, C. (2008). *The apology ritual: A philosophical theory of punishment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Deady, C.W. (2014). *Incarceration and recidivism: Lessons from abroad*. Newport: Pell Center for International Relations and Public Policy at Salve Regina University.
- Djurichkovic, A. (2011). Art in prisons: A literature review of the philosophies and impacts of visual arts programs for correctional populations.
- Duff, R. A. (2001). *Punishment, communication, and community*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gromet, D. M., & Darley, J. M. (2009). Punishment and beyond: Achieving justice through the satisfaction of multiple goals. *Law & Society Review*, 43(1), 1–37.
- Kifer, M., Hemmens, C., & Stohr, M. K. (2003). The goals of corrections: Perspectives from the line. *Criminal Justice Review*, 28(1), 47–69.
- Kothari, M. (2009). Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development.
- Larson, D. (2013, September 24). Why Scandinavian prisons are superior. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/09/why-scandinavian-prisons-are-superior/279949/>
- McNeill, F. (2012). Four forms of ‘offender’ rehabilitation: Towards an interdisciplinary perspective. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 17(1), 18-36.
- McNeill, F. (2014). Punishment as rehabilitation. In G. Bruinsma & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice* (pp. 4195-4206). New York: Springer.
- Miller, S. (2009). Retribution, rehabilitation, and the rights of prisoners. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 28(2), 238-253.
- Fulkerson, L. (2006). Apollo, paenitentia, and Ovid's Metamorphoses. *Mnemosyne*, 59(3), 388-402.

REDESIGNING PRISONS

- Riep, A. (2019). The effects of culture and punishment philosophies on recidivism: Comparing prison systems in the united states and scandinavia.
- Sharma, R. (2015, May 22). 3 reasons this 'perfect' prison system will not work in America. *Wall Street Watchdog*. Retrieved from <https://www.wallstwatchdog.com/money-career/3-reasons-why-norways-prison-system-should-not-be-replicated-in-america/>
- Shrider, E. A., Kollar, M., Chen, F., & Semega, J. (2021). Income and poverty in the United States: 2020. *Current Population Reports. US Census Bureau*.
- Slade, G. (2018). Unpacking prison reform in the former soviet union. *The Journal of Power Institutions in Post-Soviet Societies*, 19.
- Smith, P. S. (2012). A critical look at Scandinavian exceptionalism. *Penal exceptionalism*, 38-57.
- Sutton, J. E. (2020). The exclusions of imprisonment: Harms, pains, and the promise of restorative practices. *Handbook of Social Inclusion: Research and Practices in Health and Social Sciences*, 1-12.
- Thomsen, S. (2016). The Nordic corporate governance model. *Management and Organization Review*, 12(1), 189-204.
- Ward, T., & Salmon, K. (2009). The ethics of punishment: Correctional practice implications. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 14(4), 239-247.
- Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R. M., & Sellin, T. (1972). *Delinquency in a birth cohort*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wright, V. (2010). *Deterrence in criminal justice: Evaluating certainty vs. severity of punishment*. Washington, DC: Sentencing Project.

REDESIGNING PRISONS

The Final Draft will be evaluated based on the rubric below as well as all materials, instructions, and feedback provided by the instructor. Note that evaluations assume good punctuation, word choice, grammar, presentation, and strength of arguments. Evaluations also assume an appropriate quality of writing, length of response, and that language issues discussed in class have been followed appropriately. Points will be deducted if these assumption are not met. Points will also be deducted if the template has not been completely and appropriately filled out, or if any item from the template is missing. A further points' deduction will occur if an incorrectly named file is submitted.

Rubric for Evaluating the Final Research Paper

Final Research Paper

The final research paper is 10-12 pages (3200 – 3850 words, excluding reference list, abstract, and title page) and incorporates feedback from the drafting process.

Elements		Points
Content		
	Title Page	
	Abstract and Key Words	/5
	Effectively summarizes research paper (between 130 and 150 words)	
	Lists 3-5 relevant key words	
	Introduction (~1 page)	/5
	Provides appropriate and compelling entry to the topic	
	Clearly articulates the research question(s) and/or thesis	
	Body (~9-11 pages)	/50
	Presents a well-structured, logically-argued, and cohesive discussion	
	Includes headings that reflect the paper organization	

REDESIGNING PRISONS

	Supports all points/arguments with credible and relevant evidence and cites definitions of key terms/ideas as applicable	
	Synthesizes multiple sources	
	Shows originality, critical thinking, and in-depth, nuanced analysis	
	Conclusion (~up to 1 page)	/8
	Restates main points and addresses the research question/thesis	
	Comes to logical conclusion from evidence	
	Makes final comment(s)	
	References	/7
	Uses correctly formatted APA in-text citations	
	Includes correctly formatted APA references	
	Contains all and only the cited texts	
	Style	/10
	Entire paper	
	Is polished in tone and style appropriate for an academic audience	
	Uses clear and sophisticated language and variety in sentence structure	
	Mechanics	/5
	Entire paper	
	Is accurate in terms of grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, word choice, and transitionals	
	Format/ Layout	/5
	Entire paper	
	Follows APA page layout (title page, running head, headings, font, etc.)	
	Revision	/5
	Incorporates feedback from the Working Draft and any consultations	

REDESIGNING PRISONS

Total		/100
--------------	--	------

