

Syllabus
CJ 7322
Advanced Research for Planning and Evaluation
Spring 2014
Th 6:30-9:30 Hines 103

Instructor: Dr. Mark Stafford
Office: Hill House 107
Phone: 245-5410
Office Hours: M 1:00-2:00, Th 5:00-6:00 and by appointment
Email: stafford@txstate.edu

Course Description

This course is an introduction to evaluation and research design methodologies and assessment techniques. The course gives students an understanding of the principles and techniques commonly used to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of criminal justice interventions.

Course Objectives

Students who complete the course should be able to conduct evaluation research. Students should be able to:

1. classify and apply specific evaluation and research design methodologies and assessment techniques;
2. identify typical evaluation research challenges and issues and specify how to address them;
3. describe and evaluate the evidence for specific criminal justice and crime policies.

Classes will be structured around instructor- and student-led discussions of class readings and student proposals. I will facilitate these discussions and ensure that we cover as full a range of topics/issues as possible. Although I will lecture on certain topics, evaluation research is best learned from dialogue informed by readings and independently wrestling with evaluation issues.

Course Requirements

Other than attending class (see "Policies" below) and reading the assigned materials, the course requirements are as follows:

(1) **Proposal** (50% of course grade): A proposal for evaluating a crime program or policy is due at the end of the semester. The proposal should follow the template used by the National Institute of Justice (<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/funding/welcome.htm>), including an abstract, introduction, background (literature review and broader social, political, and research context), statement of the problem, goals and objectives, expected benefits, data, evaluation design, and methodology, staffing, timeline, budget, and appendices with drafts of any instruments that may be used. You do not have to do the research, just propose the research you would do if funded.

(2) **Proposal Presentation** (20% of course grade): Each student will provide a 20-minute presentation of his/her proposal. It should summarize the proposal's goals and

methodology, expected findings, and relevance for theory, research, and policy. The class will then ask questions and provide suggestions for improving the proposal.

(3) **Summaries of assigned articles** (15% of course grade): Every student will submit summaries of 10 of the assigned book chapters or journal articles. Each summary should be two typed, double-spaced pages and should outline the major points of the chapter/article.

The summary of a particular chapter/article is due on the day it is scheduled to be discussed.

(4) **Discussion questions** (15% of course grade): Every student will prepare two discussion questions each week. These questions should be derived from the assigned readings and distributed to every member of the class by email no later than 12:00 p.m. on the day of the class. The questions will be used to focus class discussion.

Policies

Class attendance is mandatory. If you are absent from two classes, your course grade will be reduced by a full letter. If you are absent from three classes, your course grade will be reduced by two full letters, and so on.

I will discuss appropriate accommodations that you may require as a student with a disability. Before accommodations will be made, you may be required to provide proper documentation.

Texas State University Honor Code

As members of a community dedicated to learning, inquiry, and creation, the students, faculty, and administration of our University live by the principles in this Honor Code. These principles require all members of this community to be conscientious, respectful, and honest.

WE ARE CONSCIENTIOUS. We complete our work on time and make every effort to do it right. We come to class and meetings prepared and are willing to demonstrate it. We hold ourselves to doing what is required, embrace rigor, and shun mediocrity, special requests, and excuses.

WE ARE RESPECTFUL. We act civilly toward one another and we cooperate with each other. We will strive to create an environment in which people respect and listen to one another, speaking when appropriate, and permitting other people to participate and express their views.

WE ARE HONEST. We do our own work and are honest with one another in all matters. We understand how various acts of dishonesty, like plagiarizing, falsifying data, and giving or receiving assistance to which one is not entitled, conflict as much with academic achievement as with the values of honesty and integrity.

ADDRESSING ACTS OF DISHONESTY

Students accused of dishonest conduct may have their cases heard by the faculty member. The student may also appeal the faculty member's decision to the Honor Code Council. Students and faculty will have the option of having an advocate present to insure their rights. Possible actions that may be taken range from exoneration to expulsion.

The policies and procedures regarding Honor Code violations are outlined at <http://www.txstate.edu/effective/upps/upps-07-10-01.html>.

Schedule and Required Readings

All of the readings are available on TRACS.

Schedule	Topic and assigned readings
January 16	<p><i>Introduction</i></p> <p>Richard Berk's "Evidence-Based Versus Junk-Based Evaluation Research," <i>Evaluation Review</i>, June 2011.</p> <p>David Farrington's "A Short History of Randomized Experiments in Criminology," <i>Evaluation Review</i>, June 2003.</p> <p>David Farrington's "Methodological Quality Standards for Evaluation Research," <i>The Annals of the American Society of Political and Social Science</i>, May 2003.</p>
January 23	<p><i>Evaluation Types</i></p> <p>Diana Eptstein and Jacob A. Klerman's "When is a Program Ready for Rigorous Impact Evaluation?" <i>Evaluation Review</i>, October 2012.</p> <p>Finn-Aage Esbensen et al.'s "Multimethod Strategy for Assessing Program Fidelity," <i>Evaluation Review</i>, February 2011.</p> <p>Chris Melde's "Addressing Program Fidelity Using Onsite Observations and Program Provider Descriptions of Program Delivery," <i>Evaluation Review</i>, December 2006.</p>
January 30	<p><i>Propensity Score Matching</i></p> <p>Elizabeth Evans et al.'s "Comparative Effectiveness of California's Proposition 36 and Drug Court Programs Before and After Propensity Score Matching," <i>Crime and Delinquency</i>, October 2010.</p> <p>Jason Luellen et al.'s "Propensity Scores," <i>Evaluation Review</i>, December 2005.</p>
February 6	<p><i>Domestic Violence</i></p> <p>Robert Davis et al.'s "Increasing the Proportion of Domestic Violence Arrests That Are Prosecuted," <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, March 2003.</p> <p>Angela Gover et al.'s "Combating Domestic Violence," <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, November 2003.</p> <p>Elizabeth Vigdor and James Mercy's "Do Laws Restricting Access to Firearms by Domestic Violence Offenders Prevent Intimate Partner Homicide?" <i>Evaluation Review</i>, June 2006.</p>

Christy Visher et al.'s "Reducing Intimate Partner Violence," *Criminology and Public Policy*, November 2008.

February 13 *Prisoner Reentry*
Grant Duwe's "The Benefits of Keeping Idle Hands Busy," *Crime and Delinquency*, November 2012.

Sheldon Zhang et al.'s "Preventing Parolees from Returning to Prison Through Community-Based Reintegration," *Crime and Delinquency*, October 2006.

February 20 *Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences – No Class*

February 27 *Specialty Courts*
Denise Gottfredson et al.'s "The Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court," *Evaluation Review*, February 2005.

John Hepburn and Angela Harvey's "The Effect of the Threat of Legal Sanction on Program Retention and Completion," *Crime and Delinquency*, April 2007.

John MacDonald et al.'s "The Efficacy of the Rio Hondo DUI Court," *Evaluation Review*, February 2007.

March 6 *Sex Offenders*
Elizabeth Letourneau et al.'s "Two-Year Follow-Up of a Randomized Effectiveness Trial Evaluating MST for Juveniles Who Sexually Offend," *Journal of Family Psychology*, November 2013.

Lisa Sample and Timothy Bray's "Are Sex Offenders Dangerous?" *Criminology and Public Policy*, November 2003.

Bob Vasquez et al.'s "The Influence of Sex Offender Registration and Notification Laws in the United States," *Crime and Delinquency*, April 2008.

March 13 *Spring Break*

March 20 *Drugs*
Allison Gandhi et al.'s "The Devil is in the Details," *Evaluation Review*, February 2007.

Dennis Gorman and Charles Huber, Jr.'s "The Social Construction of 'Evidence-Based Drug Prevention Programs,'" *Evaluation Review*, August 2009.

Debra Zand et al.'s "Predictors of Retention In An Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Prevention Study," *Evaluation Review*, April 2006.

March 27

Gangs

Finn-Aage Esbensen et al.'s "Short- and Long-Term Outcome Results from a Multisite Evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T Program," *Criminology and Public Policy*, August 2013.

Andrew Papachristos' "Two Decades of G.R.E.A.T." *Criminology and Public Policy*, August 2013.

April 3

Ethics

David Weisburd's Ethical Practice and Evaluation of Interventions in Crime and Justice," *Evaluation Review*, June 2003.

April 10

Student Presentations

April 17

Student Presentations

April 24

Student Presentations