

**CRIJ 5350 (CRN #27100)**  
**Program Evaluation and Evidence-Based Practices**  
**Tues, Thurs 4:30-5:50 pm—EDU 114**  
**January 18- May 5, 2022**

**Professor: Dr. Leanne Alarid**

**Department of Criminal Justice**

**Office: Education Building, Suite 111**

**Phone: 915-747-7087 (Landline— this number cannot accept texts)**

**E-mail: [LAlarid@utep.edu](mailto:LAlarid@utep.edu)**

**Use Blackboard to:**

**View Grades in course; Access/Read Required Articles**

**Print off extra syllabus; Contact other students in the class**

**COURSE DESCRIPTION:**

This graduate seminar provides students with foundational knowledge of evidence-based practices, so that students appreciate how criminal justice program evaluations are designed and implemented using sound research methodology to determine whether justice programs work as envisioned.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

1. Understand and apply key concepts and methodologies to develop your own CJ program evaluation.
2. Access available resources on promising and effective criminal justice programs and practices.
3. Interpret and describe empirical studies on program evaluations and evidence-based practices (comparison/contrast methodology paper).
4. Improve oral presentation skills.
5. Provide constructive criticism about how to improve an evaluation (peer reviews)
6. Learn about responding to grant proposals and the grant writing process.

**REQUIRED TEXTS:**

Vito, Gennaro F. and George E. Higgins (2015). *Practical Program Evaluation for Criminal Justice*. New York: Routledge. ISBN# 978-1-4557-7770-9

Patterson, George T., and Warren K. Graham (2018). *Clinical Interventions in Criminal Justice Settings: Evidence-Based Practice*. Elsevier/Academic Press. ISBN #978-0-12-811381-3

Additional Required Articles are posted on Blackboard by the author's last name—the before class date the article is to be read is listed on the syllabus schedule (last 2 pages)

## **COURSE REQUIREMENTS:**

- |  |            |
|--|------------|
| 1. CLASS DISCUSSANT                                    | 25 points  |
| 2. CLASS PARTICIPATION                                 | 25 points  |
| 3. Take-Home Exam                                      | 50 points  |
| 4. Methodological Comparison/Contrast of 2 articles    | 50 points  |
| 5. CREATE YOUR OWN PROGRAM EVALUATION                  |            |
| a. ORAL PRESENTATION                                   | 25 points  |
| b. FINAL PAPER   | 100 points |
| 6. PEER REVIEWS of 2 other student program evaluations | 25 points  |

### **GRADING: 300 point scale**

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Total Point Range</u>
A	270-300
B	240-269
C	210-239
D	180-209
F	0-179

**NOTE: Grades are assigned according to the total points earned; there is no rounding or curving.**

\*\*\*\*\*

## **DETAILS OF COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

### **I. CLASS DISCUSSANT: (25 points)**

- ◆ One student discussant will be assigned to lead the class discussion on the readings assigned for that particular night (except for two nights there will be 2 discussants who will divide the articles).
- ◆ A “discussant” will be graded on the ability to illicit class discussion with good questions, the ability to synthesize the readings (summary, how they connect/converge, where they diverge, limitations), and the main takeaways of the readings to conclude the discussion.
- ◆ To prepare for the discussant role, carefully read the assigned readings and come up with 4-5 general questions that will illicit discussion by other students and also help students understand the readings. The questions should pertain to these readings, elicit broader applications and/or can connect to previous readings if applicable. Map out main themes, strengths, and/or broader connections to help with your synthesis.
- ◆ Decide the ordering of the questions and **email the questions in that order to Dr. Alarid by midnight the night before your class.** She will list these questions in a prepared slide for the whole class
- ◆ Your synthesis/takeaways will be orally presented within the circle, and you can use notes to help you remember. Prepare to ask follow-up questions.
- ◆ Dr. Alarid will model what the discussion should look like earlier in the semester.

### **II. CLASS PARTICIPATION (25 points)**

- ◆ Every student is to have read the designated chapters/articles before class and to actively participate in discussions about the readings.
- ◆ Participation by the rest of the class is expected on days we have a designated discussant. Participation means asking questions, critiquing, commenting on the

- readings, volunteering to participate, and/or stating your opinion so others can learn from you.
- ◆ We will be doing some in-class exercises. Some of these applications may extend out-of-class to the following week for you to finish and submit the following week as part of the participation grade.

### **III. TAKE-HOME EXAM (50 points)**

To ensure that you are *understanding* the readings, a take-home exam of between 5-8 short answer questions will be handed out in class during Week 6--one week before it is due. Submission of the take-home exam is in class in hard copy.

### **IV. METHODOLOGICAL COMPARISON/CONTRAST OF 2 ARTICLES (50 points)**

Pick ONE topic from the list of 4 topics below. Read only the two articles that have been assigned for that topic (*you are not reading all 8 articles*). In one 3-6 page paper, compare and contrast those 2 articles by using a summary table and determine which article/study of the two is methodologically stronger (defined by **how the study was conducted**—*not* by the findings/results, and *not* by how effective the program is/was).

1. Police crackdowns: Fritsch, Caeti and Taylor (1999) vs. Smith (2001)
2. Problem-Solving Courts: Henggeler et al (2006) vs. Hartley and Baldwin (2019)
3. Prison-based Substance Abuse Treatment: Hall et al (2004) vs. Duwe (2010)
4. Alternatives to juvenile commitments: Barton and Butts (1990) vs. Sontheimer & Goodstein (1993)

In the summary table, identify for each article:

- The purpose of each specific evaluation.
- What were the implied or stated program goals?
- What were the implied or stated research questions/hypotheses?
- What was the research design/methodology?
- Who were the participants? How many were in the sample?
- What kinds of data were collected?
- How was the data collected? (Were instruments used?)
- Where and when was the data collected?
- What were the outcome measures (DV)?
- What independent variables were used to measure the outcomes?
- What were the findings?
- What were the limitations of this study?

In your conclusion, determine which one of those two evaluations is methodologically stronger than the other and justify **WHY**.

## V. CREATE YOUR OWN PROGRAM EVALUATION

Each student will choose a program to evaluate and create components of the evaluation based on reading assignments, learned concepts and exercises we do in class.

### TOPIC SELECTION

Your program evaluation topic can be based on an actual functioning program or a brand new program that has not been evaluated. This could be a CJ program that you knew about at an internship placement, your current place of employment, or a program of interest in an area for which you have an interest in exploring.

Tools to begin topic selection will be provided to you during Week 2 classes. Each student must select a program within a topic area by the beginning of Week 4. Start by choosing any criminal justice-related topic of choice, and then research possible programs in that area. Ideally, you will want to select a program within your interest area to evaluate—not just the interest area. Each selected program **must be unique and different for each student in the class**, so it may be good to have 2 programs chosen—**rank order them and submit at the Feb 8 class**.

### ORAL PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED EVALUATION (25 points)

Each student will be making one oral presentation to the class at their designated “stakeholder meeting” in mid April.

The presentation is meant to give all of us in the class (AKA, the “stakeholders”) a summary of the proposed evaluation plan for your final paper/program evaluation (what you intend to do).

The presentation is limited to 15 minutes of talking and 5 minutes of Q&A.

The presentation must have visual aids in the form of: power point slides or a 16 x 25 foot poster that can be viewed from 10 feet away.

The presenter should have a clear concept of their project (while the draft does not have to be complete, the more complete the proposal is at this stage, the more the reviewers have to work with and the less work you’ll have to do the last week of the semester).

### FINAL PAPER (100 points)

Once the presentation has taken place and the peer reviews are returned, this paper is to be finished with a detailed written account of your program evaluation, organized into the 5 parts described below. This paper should be between 9-12 double-spaced pages.

Title of paper should clearly indicate what program is being evaluated

Part 1: Needs Assessment and Program Theory. Why is this evaluation important, and what theory or theories are behind the program chosen?

Part 2: Logic Model. Draw a visual depiction of the program inputs and outputs

Part 3: Process Evaluation. Provide detail regarding the program, policy, and/or people under consideration. How will program participants be identified, recruited, and/or selected? How many people will be sampled? How will you ensure program fidelity? What data will be collected at this stage?

Part 4: Outcome Measures. What variables will you collect to measure outcomes? List out each variable and define each. Which ones are Independent Variables? Which ones are Dependent Variables?

Part 5: Possible Challenges. Discuss any possible ethical, procedural, and/or financial challenges that might be encountered during this evaluation, and how those might be remedied.

## **VI. TWO PEER REVIEWS (25 points)**

Peer reviews are the reviews you conduct of other proposals. Each student will review two different student evaluation proposals in the class. The schedule of presentations and peer reviews will be assigned at random, depending on the number of people in the class. The review forms will be posted on Blackboard in a Microsoft Word document in a question format for each student to download in advance.

The peer review will be based on the power point slides/poster and by listening to the stakeholder's presentation. During the presentation, the reviewers are encouraged to ask the presenter for clarification to complete their review.

Grading of the peer review will be based not on the reviews you *receive* from others on your project, rather, peer reviews will be graded **on the completeness of reviews you provide to others about their proposals--** based on the information you have been given during the presentation. If the presenter has not provided the information at their presentation, it is up to you as the reviewer to ask the questions you need to complete your review.

Submit 2 hard copies of each peer review (2 copies x 2 reviews) on April 28. One copy to Dr. Alarid and one copy to the presenter so that presenters can make any desired changes prior to submitting the final evaluation paper via Blackboard to Dr. Alarid on May 5.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **CLASSROOM POLICIES**

### **LATE ASSIGNMENTS**

To be considered "on time," assignments are due at the beginning of class if we are meeting in class, or by 6:00 pm if we are not meeting as a class (refer to the course schedule on this distinction) Assignments submitted after that time are considered late.

The amount of points equal to one full letter grade will be automatically deducted for (approximately each 6 hour period that an assignment is submitted late (e.g., deduction of one letter grade for an assignment submitted between 4:35 pm and 10:30 pm; and two letter grades after 10:30 pm, etc.). Due to the times above, late submissions will have to be emailed to Dr. Alarid as an attachment so she has record of your submission time.

The only exception is if a student can provide a written medical excuse that is accepted by Dr. Alarid, that reasonably substantiates the reason for the late submission. Please note that written documentation is accepted only for medical reasons and must be submitted within 72 hours of the deadline.

Written documentation for working late, childcare, transportation problems, or other non-medical reason, while it certainly may affect your ability to submit an assignment on time, will still result in applying the late penalty above.

If you have concerns about your ability to submit an assignment on time on a particular due date (e.g., you know you will be working late), you may certainly submit assignments early (I will hang onto the assignment, but it will not be graded until after the regular due date has passed).

## **ATTENDANCE POLICY**

In graduate classes, attendance and reading preparation is essential to getting the best possible learning experience, and the most out of the class.

### Written Documentation Absences for Medical Reasons Only

**If you are ill, do not come to class!** If you are ill or need to quarantine during a day you are a discussant, presenting or doing a peer review, contact Dr. Alarid as soon as possible via email or phone and we will have to reschedule and/or switch with another student who agrees to switch. Reasonable accommodations will be made if and when possible if you are ill and/or test positive for COVID. To get these accommodations, provide Dr. Alarid with a written medical excuse or test result (e.g., send picture(s) of the documentation via email) will ensure that these absences will not negatively impact your “Class Participation” grade. Please note that written documentation absences above are only for medical reasons, and do not pertain to working late, childcare, transportation problems, or other reasons that may affect attendance.

### Two Absences Without Documentation

In addition to COVID, there may be other unanticipated things that arise that we don’t plan for (e.g., for illness for which you cannot or do not want to provide documentation, working late, childcare, funeral, transportation problems, and/or an unanticipated event or appointment). Students are allowed 2 absences for any reason with no excuses needed. I urge you to use these days wisely when you really need them. While these two absences will not negatively impact your “Class Participation” grade, the “no-excuse absences” cannot be on days you are a discussant, presenting or doing a peer review for someone else. And, while the no-excuse absences cover the class attendance, **students are still expected to submit any assignments on time that are due on that day** in order to avoid letter grade deductions.

## **COVID-19 PROTOCOLS**

Please stay home and let your professor know as soon as possible if you are feeling sick, or experiencing COVID-19 symptoms. If you have tested positive for COVID-19, please report your results to [covidaction@utep.edu](mailto:covidaction@utep.edu).

The Center for Disease Control and Prevention recommends that people during times of substantial or high COVID-19 transmission wear face masks when indoors such as in the classroom.

- Mask wearing during class is highly recommended, but not mandatory.
- I will bring a few extra masks to class if you forgot yours, and want one—see me.
- I will be wearing a mask in class, except for when I am at the front of the classroom actively speaking to the class as a whole.

UTEP and the City of El Paso are co-sponsoring free drive-through COVID testing at our “mega site” at 3333 Mesa Street, daily from 8:30 a.m. - 4 p.m. There are two reserved lanes for UTEP people with IDs and their household members in the same vehicle. There are long waits there at times. [Online preregistration](#) can further expedite access to testing. While the mega site provides testing to UTEP household members, it does not provide rapid tests there.

**Free walk-up rapid testing** is available at the Honors House/Faculty Lounge, located right behind the Liberal Arts Building and the Academic Advising Center-- Monday through Thursday from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. **ONLY for faculty, staff, and students (with UTEP ID and Driver’s License)**--- but is NOT available to household family members. That program will conduct both rapid antigen and PCR confirmation testing on every sample. [Preregistration](#) with office location code “UTEPS” is encouraged. Please consult the [campus map](#) if you haven’t been there before.

### **ACADEMIC DISHONESTY**

Academic dishonesty includes turning in someone else’s assignment from a previous class, or plagiarism: “(1) use by paraphrase or direct quotation of the published or unpublished work of another person without fully and properly crediting the author with citations or biographical reference; (2) unacknowledged use of work/materials prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic materials; (3) unacknowledged use of original work/material that has been produced through collaboration with others without release in writing from collaborators.”

I take cases of alleged academic dishonesty seriously. For students who are found to have allegedly engaged in any form of academic dishonesty, the case will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution (OSCCR). While the case is being investigated by OSCCR, an “I” (Incomplete) will be assigned until the case is resolved. If the student is found by OSCCR to have engaged in misconduct, sanctions may include a failing grade on the assignment or exam in question, a failing grade in the course, suspension, or dismissal from the University. See <http://www.utep.edu/dos>

### **TAPE RECORDING OF CLASSES AND OTHER LEARNING NEEDS**

I support helping students who are in need of reasonable accommodations to help in the learning process or with taking exams as defined by UTEP Center for Accommodations and Support Services (e.g., note takers, tape recording class sessions, sign language interpreters, or other aids). However, any student who is in need of a special accommodation **MUST** first register and provide the instructor with written approval from the UTEP Center for Accommodations and

Support Services (CASS) before accommodations will be made. CASS is located in Room 106 of the Union East Building. Call 915-747-5148 or visit their website: <http://sa.utep.edu/cass/>  
Tape recording of classes is considered to be a special accommodation and not allowed unless first approved in writing by CASS.

### COURSE SCHEDULE

DATE	TOPIC COVERAGE	READING BEFORE CLASS: Vito & Higgins/ Patterson & Graham are required texts; All other readings are articles on BB	DISCUSSANT	ASSIGNMENT DUE
<b>Week 1</b>				
T Jan 18	Introductions/Syllabus			
Th Jan 20	Defining Program Evaluation	Vito & Higgins Ch 1		
<b>Week 2</b>				
T Jan 25	Defining Evidence-Based Practices; Sherman's "What Works" Rating Scale	Patterson & Graham Ch 1; Sherman et al. 1998		
Th Jan 27	Locating EBP Programs: NIJ's Crime Solutions.gov SAMHSA's National Registry; OJJDP Registry; Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development	Patterson & Graham, Ch 5		
<b>Week 3</b>				
T Feb 1	Meta-Analysis/Systematic Reviews; The Campbell Collaborative 2000	Petrosino & Lavenberg 2007; Lum et al 2020; Weisburd, Farrington & Gill 2017;		
Th Feb 3	Evaluation Strategies and Logic Models	Vito & Higgins Ch 2		
<b>Week 4</b>				
T Feb 8	Logic Model Exercise; Finalizing Program Eval Topics			<b>Evaluation Topic Due (Submit top 1 or 2 choices in class)</b>
Th Feb 10	Needs Assessments	Vito & Higgins, Ch 3		
<b>Week 5</b>				
T Feb 15	Program Theory	Vito & Higgins, Ch 4 Bowen et al 2019		
Th Feb 17	Process Evaluation; Fidelity Implementation	Patterson & Graham Ch 3; Vito & Higgins, Ch 5		
<b>Week 6</b>				
T Feb 22	Process Evaluation Examples	Lawrence et al 2018; Middleton et al 2019; Magana, Perrone & Malm 2021 Miller & Miller 2016	Discussants #1 and #2	
Th Feb 24	Classic Experimental Design	Patterson & Graham Ch 2; Vito & Higgins, Ch .6	Discussant #3	



<b>DATE</b>	<b>TOPIC COVERAGE</b>	<b>READING BEFORE CLASS:</b> Vito & Higgins/ Patterson & Graham are required texts; All other readings are articles on BB	<b>DISCUSSANT</b>	<b>ASSIGNMENT DUE</b>
<b>Week 7</b>				
T March 1	Random Control Trials in CJ	Ahlin 2015; Goodman et al 2018; Killias, Aebi & Ribeaud 2000	Discussant #4	
Th March 3	Quasi-Experimental Designs	Patterson & Graham Ch 2; Vito & Higgins, Ch .6	Discussant #5	
<b>Week 8</b>				
T March 8	<b>Class will not meet: OUT OF CLASS TIME TO BE SPENT FINISHING AND SUBMITTING EXAM</b>			<b>Take-Home Exam Due on BB at 6:00pm</b>
Th March 10	EBPs/What Works in Policing? (Place-based and Community Policing)	Lum & Koper 2016; Nagin & Weisburd 2013;	Discussant #6	
SPRING BREAK WEEK- NO CLASSES HELD				
<b>Week 9</b>				
T March 22	<b>Class will not meet: OUT OF CLASS TIME TO BE SPENT FINISHING AND SUBMITTING Methodological Comparison/Contrast Paper</b>			<b>Comparison/Contrast Paper Due on BB by 6:00 pm</b>
Th March 24	Other Policing and Crime Prevention Interventions	Ratcliffe et al. 2009 Fox & Farrington 2015 Koper & Lum 2019	Discussant #7	
<b>Week 10</b>				
T March 29	Cost-Benefit Analysis	Vito & Higgins, Ch. 7; Roman 2004; Piza et al 2016	Discussant #8	
Th March 31	Risk Assessments	Patterson & Graham Ch 6 Eckhouse et al 2019; Spivak et al 2021	Discussant #9	
<b>Week 11</b>				
T April 5	Youth-Based Outcomes; EBPs in Juvenile Justice	Patterson & Graham Ch. 7 Smith et al 2008; Baglivio et al 2014; Caldwell & Van Rybroek 2001	Discussants #10 and #11	
Th April 7	Substance Abuse Treatment and CBT	Patterson & Graham Ch. 8 Belenko et al 2004 Barnes et al 2017	Discussant #12	
<b>Week 12</b>				
T April 12	Outcomes for Special Populations/Crimes	Patterson & Graham Ch. 9 Grady et al 2017; Braga et al. 2019	Discussant #13	
Th April 14	Measurement and Analysis; Reporting and Using Evaluations	Vito & Higgins, Ch. 8, 9, & 10		
<b>Week 13</b>				
T April 19	Student Presentations #1-4		Each presenter has 2 peer reviewers	<b>Oral Presentations; Power Point Slides submitted to Alarid</b>
Th April 21	Student Presentations #5-9		Each presenter has 2 peer reviewers	<b>Oral Presentations; Power Point Slides submitted to Alarid</b>

<b>DATE</b>	<b>TOPIC COVERAGE</b>	<b>READING BEFORE CLASS: Vito &amp; Higgins/ Patterson &amp; Graham are required texts; All other readings are articles on BB</b>	<b>DISCUSSANT</b>	<b>ASSIGNMENT DUE</b>
<b>Week 14</b>				
T April 26	Student Presentations #10- 13		Each presenter has 2 peer reviewers	<b>Oral Presentations; Power Point Slides submitted to Alarid</b>
Th April 28	Grant Writing Process			<b>ALL Peer Reviews Due at Beginning of class- 2 hard copies of each review</b>
<b>Week 15</b>				
T May 3	Looking at Grant RFP's			
Th May 5				<b>Final Evaluation Paper Submitted in BB- Due by 6:00 pm</b>