

**USA Response: Collection of Information Prior to the
Eighth Intersessional Meeting of the Open-Ended Intergovernmental
Working Group on Prevention Established by the
Conference of States Parties to the UN Convention against Corruption**

In response to the Secretariat's request for information contained in Note Verbale CU 2017/96/DTA/CEB, the United States is pleased to provide the following response.

Information requested from States parties in relation to integrity in criminal justice institutions (arts. 7, 8 and 11)

In relation to measures concerning article 7 of the Convention and the public sector, States parties and signatories may wish to cite and summarize measures that:

- Establish and strengthen systems to ensure transparency and accountability in the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion and retirement of public officials in criminal justice institutions, including whether specific procedures exist for the recruitment and hiring of senior officials in criminal justice institutions, if they are different from other civil servants;
- Implement adequate procedures for the selection and training of individuals for public positions considered especially vulnerable to corruption in criminal justice institutions and the rotation, where appropriate, of such individuals to other positions; and
- Prescribe criteria concerning candidature for and election to public office for members of criminal justice institutions, if applicable, as well as measures to enhance transparency in the funding of candidatures and of contributions to political parties, where applicable.

The U.S. Constitution created a federal system of government in which power is shared between the federal government and the state governments. Due to this system, both the federal government and each of the state governments have their own court system and certain law enforcement responsibilities. This response is specific to the federal court system established under Article III of the U.S. Constitution, the federal judiciary and federal law enforcement agencies, and does not include courts established under any other federal jurisdiction, such as military courts.

Recruitment, Hiring, Retention:

Law enforcement responsibilities in the United States are divided between the federal government and state, county, and municipal governments. At the federal level, law enforcement responsibilities primarily fall under the executive branch. Federal law enforcement personnel are therefore subject to applicable merit hiring standards as other executive branch employees. The U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is the central human resources management agency for the executive branch. OPM develops civil service regulations consistent with the laws passed by Congress and is responsible for ensuring compliance with those laws and regulations. It delegates to the other executive branch agencies, including those with law enforcement responsibilities, the authority to operate various human resources functions, including the authority to competitively examine and hire employees.

In general, there are two basic categories of career public officials in the federal executive branch, both of which are hired under merit system principles: 1) competitive service employees, who are hired through a competitive examination process and must meet government-wide suitability and qualification standards; and 2) excepted service employees, who may be hired non-competitively but must still be found fit and qualified for their positions, either under government-wide standards or agency-specific standards. Each agency is responsible for developing selective factors, if appropriate. Personal favoritism, nepotism, and political influence are not permitted in the selection process. Any occurrence of non-merit favoritism is viewed as a “prohibited personnel practice.” The head of each agency is responsible for the prevention of prohibited personnel practices.

The U.S. Department of Justice is exclusively responsible for federal criminal prosecutions and primarily responsible for civil prosecutions. The Department of Justice employs career prosecutors whose tenures, except in special circumstances, are not for fixed terms. Career prosecutors are generally “excepted service appointments.” The official appointments are made by the Attorney General after a competitive selection process conducted by others in the Department. The hiring of career federal prosecutors is overseen by the Office of Attorney Recruitment and Management (OARM) in strict compliance with applicable federal hiring regulations. OARM reviews the suitability of every prosecutor offered a position at the Department based on a candidate’s completed security forms, fingerprint and financial background checks, as well as a full field FBI background investigation and tax and attorney bar check.

Promotions and mobility are typically within the purview of the career and appointed supervisors within each agency. In the Department of Justice, because offices, including Offices of the U.S. Attorney, vary in size from dozens of prosecutors to hundreds of prosecutors, promotions within the offices are decided by the office's management team, depending on the structure of the office. As in the rest of the career service of the executive branch, decisions on performance reviews, promotions, reassignments, bonuses, discipline and other administrative actions are initially made by supervisors, following standard personnel procedures. Promotion to a small number of career supervisory positions within the Senior Executive Service is more formal, and must involve advertisement, a qualification process and interviews. Positions appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, which includes U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshals, and the heads of all executive agencies including those with law enforcement components, are not eligible for promotion.

Training:

Even prior to coming on board, prospective employees must be alerted to the importance of the Department of Justice's ethics program. As part of executive-branch wide requirements, agencies must issue notices to prospective employees in written offers of employment regarding the agencies' ethics programs and applicable ethics requirements.¹ Senior officials within the Department of Justice who are serving in presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed (PAS) positions also receive substantial counselling with regard to the application of the federal conflict of interest laws prior to appointment and in conjunction with their preparation and submission of their first public financial disclosure report for purposes of their nomination and appointment.

In addition, agencies, including the Department of Justice, must issue notices regarding applicable ethics requirements to employees who are newly hired or promoted to supervisory positions.² The notices emphasize that, in their new roles as supervisors, these employees will have heightened personal responsibility for advancing government ethics.³ This notice must be issued within one year of appointment, which corresponds to the time period established in the regulations of the Office of Personnel Management for supervisory training.⁴

¹ 5 C.F.R. § 2638.303.

² 5 C.F.R. § 2638.306.

³ 5 C.F.R. § 2638.103.

⁴ 5 C.F.R. § 412.202(b).

The ethics notices to prospective employees and new supervisors are complemented by ethics training requirements. Within 3 months from the time an employee begins work for a federal agency, including those with law enforcement responsibilities, the agency must provide the employee with initial ethics training. The initial ethics training must focus on ethics laws and regulations that the Designated Agency Ethics Official (DAEO) deems appropriate for the audience and must address concepts related to financial conflicts of interest, impartiality, misuse of position, and gifts. Agencies must also provide the employee a summary of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Executive Branch Employees, relevant agency supplemental standards; and instructions for how to contact the DAEO.⁵

In addition, agency leaders must receive an ethics briefing around the time of appointment.⁶ This requirement applies to most civilians serving in presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed positions, and supplements other applicable requirements. For the Department of Justice, this includes the Attorney General, U.S. Attorneys, and U.S. Marshals. During this individualized briefing, the agency ethics official discusses the appointee's basic recusal obligation, the mechanisms for recusal, the commitments made in the appointee's ethics agreement, and the potential for conflicts of interest arising from any financial interests acquired after the nominee financial disclosure report was filed.

Executive branch employees, including Department of Justice attorneys, are required to complete certain training requirements, determined by the type of position held, on an annual basis. This includes ethics training on financial conflicts of interest, impartiality, misuse of position, and gifts. Prosecutors can seek advice from a variety of sources, including an Ethics Advisor or the Departmental Ethics Office.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is one of the primary national security agencies at the federal level, with both law enforcement and intelligence gathering responsibilities. At the FBI, ethics function resides organizationally within the Office of Integrity and Compliance (OIC). The OIC administers the day-to-day operation of all aspects of the FBI Ethics and Integrity Program. This includes overseeing and administering the Ethics and Integrity Training Program to ensure compliance with all executive branch-wide regulations (as noted in the preceding paragraphs) and FBI policies. For new FBI Special Agents, ethics is woven into the

⁵ 5 C.F.R. § 2638.304 .

⁶ 5 C.F.R. § 2638.305.

curriculum of the FBI's New Agents' Training which is conducted at the FBI Academy. A course on ethical leadership is provided during regularly scheduled classes throughout the duration of the program.

Candidature

There are no federal law enforcement positions that are filled through elections.

In relation to article 8 of the Convention and measures to establish or promote codes of conduct by criminal justice institutions, States parties and signatories may wish to cite and summarize measures that:

- Establish or improve procedures, rules and regulations for the reporting, including by members of criminal justice institutions, of acts of corruption to appropriate authorities and the mechanisms for the protection of reporting persons;
- Establish or strengthen existing disciplinary procedures and mechanisms to enforce codes of conduct or ethics, standards of professional conduct and conflict of interest legislation; and
- Detect and prevent possible conflicts of interest, such as systems requiring members of criminal justice institutions to make declarations to appropriate authorities regarding, inter alia, their outside activities, employment, investments, income, assets and substantial gifts or benefits from which a conflict of interest may result, including as they take office and regularly during the performance of their public functions.

Reporting:

The United States has a system of laws and regulations governing the protection of public officials and private citizens who, in good faith, report acts of corruption and misconduct. The Whistleblower Protection Act (WPA) provides statutory protections for federal employees who engage in "whistleblowing," that is, making a disclosure evidencing illegal or improper government activities. The protections of the WPA apply to most federal executive branch employees and become applicable when a "personnel action" is taken "because of" a "protected disclosure" made by a "covered employee."

All executive branch employees, including those in federal law enforcement agencies, are required to report wrongdoing. The Department of Justice *U.S.*

Attorney's Manual outlines requirements that Department employees report to their United States Attorney or Assistant Attorney General, or other appropriate supervisor, any evidence or non-frivolous allegation of misconduct that may be in violation of any law, rule, regulation, order, or applicable professional standard. The supervisor shall evaluate whether the misconduct at issue is serious, and if so shall report the evidence or non-frivolous allegation to the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) or to the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR). Similarly, the FBI requires its employees to report to proper authority any known or suspected failures to adhere to the law by themselves or others.

The U.S. Office of Special Counsel (OSC), a federal executive branch agency, has a Disclosure Unit (DU) that serves as a safe conduit for the receipt and evaluation of whistleblower disclosures from federal employees, former employees and applicants for federal employment. The Special Counsel may order an agency head to investigate and report on the disclosure; and after any such investigation, the Special Counsel must send the agency's report, with the whistleblower's comments, to the President and to Congressional oversight committees.

Codes of Conduct:

All executive branch employees, including those in the Department of Justice and other federal law enforcement agencies, are bound by a series of ethics policies and provisions.⁷ All full-time non-career executive branch appointees (including U.S. Attorneys) are also subject to the Ethics Pledge as set forth in Executive Order 13770, which includes recusal obligations in addition to those imposed by statute or regulation, post-employment restrictions in addition to those imposed by statute, and a ban on accepting gifts from lobbyists or lobbying organizations.

All Department of Justice and federal law enforcement personnel are also subject to the Hatch Act, which generally prohibits executive branch employees from engaging in partisan political activity while on duty, in a federal facility or using federal property. Political activity is activity directed toward the success or failure of a political party, candidate for partisan political office, or partisan political group. The statute carries serious penalties including removal from federal employment. Under the Hatch Act, stricter rules apply to employees serving in several federal law enforcement agencies, including but not limited to, the FBI, the Secret Service, and Office of Law Enforcement of the Bureau of Alcohol,

⁷ These include the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees in the Executive Branch and Principals of Ethical Conduct. In addition, employees are subject to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 201 et seq., making criminal certain bribery, graft, and conflict of interest activities by employees or former employees.

Tobacco, and Firearms, the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice as well as career members of Senior Executive Service. These employees are prohibited from participating actively in political management or political campaigns even when off-duty. In addition, it is the long-standing practice of the Department to require political appointees to adhere to the prohibitions applicable to further-restricted employees.

Conflicts of Interest:

Executive branch employees are subject to various conflict of interest rules.⁸ Those holding certain non-career positions are also subject to more stringent restrictions on their outside activities and limitations on earned income.⁹ The Ethics in Government Act requires senior executive branch officials, including senior Department of Justice and federal law enforcement officials, to file public financial disclosure reports. Individuals in positions that require public financial disclosure must file their disclosures upon entry into the position, annually, and then upon leaving the position. Additionally, employees in positions requiring public financial disclosures must file periodic transaction reports of certain personal financial transactions in stocks, bonds, and other securities. These transaction reports are due within 45 days of the transaction or within 30 days of notification of the transaction.

Less senior career prosecutors and law enforcement officials file annual confidential financial disclosure reports, or Certifications to No-Conflicts of Interest, as described above. Confidential financial disclosure reports require similar information to the public financial disclosure reports but do not require the listing of values of assets, income, liabilities, and gifts or the listing of certain other interests such as cash bank accounts and diversified mutual funds that are unlikely to give rise to a conflict of interest.

The Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch have administrative penalties which can include reprimand, suspension, demotion, transfer and firing. Administrative sanctions are imposed by the agency which employs the individual who has been found to have violated the administrative code of conduct following standard personnel procedures for imposing discipline.

⁸ These include, but are not limited to, the criminal conflict of interest statutes (18 U.S.C. § 201 et seq.), Executive Order 12674 on Principles of Ethical Conduct as amended by Executive Order 12731, the uniform Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch at 5 C.F.R. Part 2635, and the Ethics Pledge as set forth in Executive Order 13770.

⁹ 5 U.S.C. app § 501 et seq.

Individual prosecutors may face civil and criminal prosecution in addition to disciplinary action for violations of the policies. Consequences for violating criminal conflict of interest laws include imprisonment for one to five years, fines, community service and restitution to the Government.

An employee or individual who violates the Hatch Act shall be subject to administrative, civil, and/or criminal penalties. These penalties could include removal, reduction in grade, debarment from Federal employment for a period not to exceed 5 years, suspension, reprimand, or an assessment of a civil penalty.

In relation to article 11 and measures to promote the independence, integrity and impartiality of members of the judiciary and prosecution services, States parties and signatories may wish to cite and summarize measures that:

- Disseminate information and build awareness of existing national and international standards of judicial integrity, such as the Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary, the Bangalore Principles on Judicial Conduct, the Guidelines on the Role of Prosecutors and the Standards of Professional Responsibility and Statement of the Essential Duties and Rights of Prosecutors;
- Implement or improve existing induction and ongoing training requirements and curricula for members of the judiciary and prosecution services, particularly in terms of codes of conduct, integrity and independence;
- Establish or improve existing mechanisms to evaluate performance of members of the judiciary and the prosecution services, including by promoting the transparency of evaluation reports, where appropriate;
- Procedures governing asset declarations by judges and how they are used to prevent conflicts of interest, including in relation to the assignment of cases;
- Improve transparency, accountability and efficiency in procedures for case assignment and distribution;
- Provide ethical guidance or advice to officials of criminal justice institutions in relation to the performance of their duties, their relationship with actors outside the judicial process, such as the media and non-governmental organizations, or with regard to their use of new technologies and social media; and

- Assess the risks of corruption as well as the integrity and effectiveness of the judiciary, prosecution service and court system more broadly, including by soliciting inputs from court users, other stakeholders and the general public.

Build Awareness of Existing National and International Standards of Judicial Integrity:

The Federal Judicial Center is the primary research and education agency of the federal judicial system. The Center supports the efficient, effective administration of justice and judicial independence. The Center has no policy-making or enforcement authority; its role is to provide accurate, objective information and education and to encourage thorough and candid analysis of policies, practices, and procedures. Through its website, the Center provides a number of publicly available publications, including a number of ethics and codes of conduct reports, manuals, and reference guides. The Center has translated several of these documents into other languages to serve as reference to legal practitioners from other countries interested in learning more about the judicial conduct and integrity in the United States.

The standards of conduct that apply to federal judges are contained in the “Code of Conduct for United States Judges.” The Judicial Conference has continued to review and revise the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. The complete text of the Code of Conduct is made available to the public on the federal judiciary public website.¹⁰

Inductions/Ongoing Training:

The Federal Judicial Center conducts and promotes education and training for federal judges, including formal ethics training for both new and experienced judges. It also develops education and training programs for court personnel, such as those in clerks’ offices and probation and pretrial services offices. Ethics education and advice is also available to all federal judges through the Judicial Conference Committee on Codes of Conduct. The Committee’s jurisdiction is set by the Judicial Conference of the United States and broadly encompasses ethics policy for the judiciary. The Committee develops ethics codes and regulations, advises judges and employees on ethics matters, and develops ethics education programs. The Committee’s goal is to ensure that the ethics guidelines for judges

¹⁰ <http://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/code-conduct-united-states-judges>

effectively protect the fairness and impartiality of the judiciary, while also preserving judicial independence.

Through programs sponsored by the Federal Judicial Center, the Committee provides ethics education for new judges and provides ethics training for law clerks, staff attorneys, clerks and judicial assistants. Although judges' participation in ethics education is not compulsory, ethics education is featured in most continuing education programs for both new and experienced judges. The Committee's extensive training effort underscores the value and the importance the federal judiciary places on ethical conduct.

Evaluate Performance:

Justices of the Supreme Court, judges of the courts of appeals and the district courts, and judges of the Court of International Trade, are appointed under Article III of the Constitution. They are nominated and appointed by the President of the United States and must be confirmed by a majority vote of the Senate. Article III judges are appointed for life, and they can only be removed by the Congress through the impeachment process specified in the Constitution. Bankruptcy judges and magistrate judges are judicial officers of the district courts, but they are not Article III judges.

Magistrate judges are appointed by majority vote of the judges of the district court for eight-year terms. Bankruptcy judges are appointed by the circuit judges of the courts of appeals for 14-year terms. Bankruptcy judges and magistrate judges may be reappointed when their term expires. However, before reappointing a bankruptcy judge or a magistrate judge to an additional term, the appointing court must publish a public notice seeking comments on the incumbent judge's performance and convene a merit panel to recommend to the court whether the incumbent should be reappointed. Federal judges are not promoted to office or to a higher court. Each judge must be appointed to judicial office as explained above.

Asset Declaration/Conflicts of Interest:

All federal judges must file detailed annual financial disclosure reports under the Ethics in Government Act. These reports include extensive detail concerning all financial holdings, dates of acquisition and disposition, even of partial interests, board memberships, gifts and reimbursements. A judge's annual declaration is sent to the Judicial Conference of the United States, which has delegated its

authority to the Judicial Conference Committee on Financial Disclosure. In addition, the Judicial Conference requires all judges to use an electronic conflicts screening system to ensure that judges do not inadvertently fail to recuse based on financial interests in a party. Under this mandatory policy, each judge must develop a list of financial interests that would trigger recusal. The system identifies potential financial conflicts, which enables the judge to decline an assignment or, if the case has been assigned, to recuse if necessary. Once a case is assigned, a judge has a continuing obligation, under the recusal statute and the Code of Conduct, to evaluate and monitor the case for potential recusal.

By statute, federal judges may not hear cases in which they have either personal knowledge of the disputed facts, a personal bias concerning a party to the case, any earlier involvement in the case as a lawyer, or a financial interest in any party or subject matter of the case.¹¹ The standards of conduct that apply to federal judges are contained in the “Code of Conduct for United States Judges.” There is no “de minimus” exception for recusal based on a financial interest. Even owning a single share of stock in a party requires recusal. In addition, a judge cannot avoid recusal by placing assets in a blind trust, or by avoiding knowledge of the judge’s financial holdings. With respect to disqualification due to a financial interest, recusal is not required if the judge (or spouse or minor child) divests the financial interest. However, divestiture is not permitted if the judge has an interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

Improve Conditions for Case Assignment:

The day-to-day responsibility for judicial administration rests largely with each individual court and its judges. Each court is given the responsibility by statute and administrative practice to appoint its own support staff and manage its own affairs. Every court with more than one judge must implement procedures for assigning responsibility for cases to its judges. Common methods of case assignment in the trial (district) courts include random assignment, rotational assignment, subject matter assignment, and assignment by geographic division of the court.

Most federal district and bankruptcy courts randomly assign a case to a particular judge at the time it is filed, and that judge has complete responsibility for the case until it is terminated. Random assignment generally helps to ensure an equitable distribution of workloads and prevents “judge shopping.” Each district court

¹¹ 28 U.S.C. § 455,

determines how magistrate judges will be utilized for case assignment.¹² The assignment of judges to cases is also subject to the statutory and Code of Conduct provisions on recusal.

Ethical Guidance:

Judges can obtain ethics guidance in several ways. As a starting point, judges can do their own research. The statutes and the related case law, the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, the associated Commentary, and the ethics regulations adopted by the Judicial Conference are the basic resource documents. Beyond the Codes and regulations, the Committee has issued about eighty Advisory Opinions addressing judicial ethics topics that frequently arise. These published Advisory Opinions provide guidance that goes well beyond the bare terms of the recusal statutes and Code of Conduct, in order to assist judges in complying with their ethical obligations.

The published advisory opinions are available to judges and the public through the Judiciary's website.¹³

A judge can also request ethics advice directly from the Codes of Conduct Committee. The Committee provides informal ethics guidance on a broad range of issues. Judges can ask any committee member for an informal ethics opinion. Judges may also obtain informal ethics advice from experienced attorneys at the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts who serve as counsel to the Committee. In cases where an informal opinion is not sufficient or the judge raises a novel issue, the judge may also seek "formal" ethics guidance. In that situation, the Committee issues a confidential letter of advice to the judge, usually within three weeks or less.

Assess the risks of corruption

The Judicial Conduct and Disability Act 1980 Act authorizes any person to file a complaint alleging that a federal judge has engaged in conduct "prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts." The late Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist, in 2004, created a committee, led by Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer, to review implementation of the Act.¹⁴ The Strategic Plan for the Federal Judiciary was approved by the Judicial Conference

¹² See 28 U.S.C. § 636 (regarding the assignment of cases to magistrate judges).

¹³ <http://www.uscourts.gov/rules-policies/judiciary-policies/code-conduct/published-advisory-opinions>.

¹⁴ [http://www.fjc.gov/public/pdf.nsf/lookup/breyer06.pdf/\\$file/breyer06.pdf](http://www.fjc.gov/public/pdf.nsf/lookup/breyer06.pdf/$file/breyer06.pdf)

of the United States in 2010, and subsequently updated in 2015. Key aspects of the plan include pursuing improvements in the delivery of justice on a nationwide basis, enhancing access to the judicial process, and enhancing public understanding, trust, and confidence. The Plan states “accountability mechanisms must address critical risks and keep pace with changes in regulations.” This includes using technology to share information and solicit input about court procedures and policies from the public. Additionally, for every goal in the Strategic Plan, mechanisms to measure or assess the judiciary’s progress are developed. A review of the Strategic Plan also takes place every five years.

2. Please outline actions required to ensure or improve the implementation of the measures described above and any specific challenges you might be facing in this respect.

Examples of the types of challenges States parties and signatories may face include:

- Challenges in developing the proper legislative or regulatory framework for performance evaluations, the protection of persons reporting corruption cases within the criminal justice system or preventing conflicts of interest;
- Challenges in administering asset declaration and conflict of interest systems;

The United States does not have any challenges to report at this time.

3. Do you consider that any technical assistance is required in order to allow you to fully implement this provision? If so, what specific forms of technical assistance would you require?

The United States does not require technical assistance with regard to implementation of this provision.

II - Information requested from States parties in relation to education in schools and universities on anti-corruption (art. 13, para. 1 (c)) 1.

- 1. Please describe (cite and summarize) the measures your country has taken, if any, (or is planning to take, together with the related envisaged time frame) to ensure full compliance with article 13(1)(c) of the Convention and, in particular, its provision on undertaking anti-corruption education programmes in schools and universities.**

Information sought may, in particular, include the following:

- Description of educational courses or modules that have been introduced in primary and secondary schools that include aspects of corruption or related issues such as integrity, ethics, civic rights and duties, fiscal education or governance;
- Description of educational courses or modules that have been introduced in universities that include aspects of corruption or related issues such as public administration, public procurement, integrity, ethics, criminal law, or corporate governance;
- Description of innovative teaching and learning tools and methodologies that have been used to foster and facilitate education programmes in schools and universities on anti-corruption;
- Training manuals, curricula, syllabi, course packets, websites and other materials related to anticorruption education programmes in schools and universities; and
- Statistics on number of students participating in anti-corruption education programmes in schools and universities Partnerships and inter-institutional coordination

Education is primarily a state and local responsibility in the United States. States and communities, as well as public and private organizations—rather than the federal government—establish schools and colleges, develop curricula, and determine requirements for enrollment and graduation. *See* <https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html>.

Several universities in the United States have developed corruption-related programs and courses. These include, but are not limited to:

- Columbia Law School
 - Center for the Advancement of Public Integrity
<http://www.law.columbia.edu/public-integrity>
- American University Washington College of Law
 - U.S. and International Anti-Corruption Law Summer Program:
<https://www.wcl.american.edu/anti-corruption/>
- Georgetown University Law Center
 - International Efforts to Combat Corruption Seminar
http://apps.law.georgetown.edu/curriculum/tab_courses.cfm?Status=Course&Detail=1676

- George Washington University
 - Rule of Law and Anti-Corruption: <https://elliott.gwu.edu/international-development-studies/democracy-and-governance>

In addition, all American law schools are required by the American Bar Association (ABA)—a voluntary association of lawyers and law students that sets academic standards for law schools and formulates model ethical codes for the legal profession—to ensure that all students take a course on professional responsibility as part of their legal education. Professional responsibility courses usually cover basic legal ethics and judicial misconduct.

Several American business schools also have ethics course requirements. For example, inter alia, Harvard Business School, the Stern School of Business, the University of Virginia’s Business School, and the University of California-Berkeley’s Business School require students to take business ethics courses.

2. Please outline actions required to ensure or improve the implementation of article 13(1)(c) on undertaking anti-corruption education programmes in schools and universities and any specific challenges you might be facing in this respect.

Examples of the types of challenges States parties and signatories may face include:

- Challenges related to the implementation of anti-corruption educational measures such as the need to provide support to schools following the introduction of a new academic course, including through the training of academic staff responsible for delivering such courses; and
- Challenges related to resources limitations, lack of capacity, overcrowded curricula, etc.

The United States does not have any challenges to report at this time.

3. Do you consider that any technical assistance is required in order to allow you to fully implement this provision? If so, what specific forms of technical assistance would you require?

States parties and signatories are encouraged to provide a description of any such assistance already being provided, including donor information.

The United States does not require technical assistance with regard to implementation of this provision.