

LEE ONLINE

LEE ONLINE

SYLLABUS

CRJU-470: PROBATION AND PAROLE

Date: 07/29/2020

Table of Contents:	
UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT:	3
CATALOG DESCRIPTION:	3
REQUIRED TEXT(S) AND/OR SUPPORTING RESOURCES:	3
PREREQUISITE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE:	3
COURSE GOALS AND LEARNING OUTCOMES:	3
MAJOR TOPICS:	4
COURSE ASSESSMENTS:	4
EVALUATION:	5
GRADING SCALE:	5
LETTER GRADE EQUIVALENCIES:	5
UNIT AND TIME DISTRIBUTION:	6
POLICIES	6
ATTENDANCE POLICY:	6
ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY/INFORMATION:	6
LATE POLICY:	7
EXPECTATIONS	7
FACULTY EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS:	7
STUDENTS' EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY:	7
IMPORTANT STUDENT INFORMATION	8
SPECIAL NEEDS:	8
BIBLIOGRAPHY	8
KNOWLEDGE BASE/WORKING BIBLIOGRAPHY (READING LIST):	8

University Mission Statement:

Lee University is a Christian institution which offers liberal arts and professional education on both the undergraduate and graduate levels through residential and distance programs. It seeks to provide education that integrates biblical truth as revealed in the Holy Scriptures with truth discovered through the study of arts and sciences and in the practice of various professions. A personal commitment to Jesus Christ as Savior is the controlling perspective from which the educational enterprise is carried out. The foundational purpose of all educational programs is to develop within the students knowledge, appreciation, understanding, ability and skills which will prepare them for responsible Christian living in a complex world.

Catalog Description:

This course is a critical analysis of the practices and policies of probation, parole, diversion, pre-trial release, and intermediate sanctions.

Required Text(s) and/or Supporting Resources:**Required Text:**

Hanser, R.D. (2014). *Community Corrections, 2nd Edition*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc. ISBN: 9781452256634. **(Provided as a link in the course and charged to your Lee account as "Book Bundle" fee.)**

Additional Supporting Resources:

Resources included in the Learning Management System (LMS).

Prerequisite Skills and Knowledge:

CRJU-270

Course Goals and Learning Outcomes:**PURPOSE**

This course examines the critical issues and trends of probation and parole and other community-based sanctions in the United States. Specifically, it will survey models and promising evidence-based practices and the issues that confront criminal justice practitioners in forming community corrections, prisoner release and re-entry, and community-based alternatives. Inclusive in the course is special attention to intermediate punishments, treatment of special populations, and juvenile offenders.

General Learning Objectives (Course Goals):

This course seeks to:

1. Present various types of community based correctional practices and programming.
2. Demonstrate the decision-making process involved in releasing an individual from detention.
3. Explain how probation is organized and operates.
4. Describe the various types of residential community correctional facilities.
5. Introduce how restorative principles can ameliorate the existing probation and parole practices.
6. Differentiate between discretionary parole and mandatory supervised release.
7. Compare and contrast the differences and similarities of the adult and juvenile justice system.
8. Detail faith-based alternative to probation and parole.

Specific Behavioral Objectives (*Learning Outcomes*):

As a result of the activities and study in this course, students will be able to:

1. Assess the implications of probation and parole and other community-based correction practices.
2. Explain how probation and parole practices impact policy decisions.
3. Evaluate various practices in the larger context of controlling behavior.
4. Critique evidence-based practices that promote faith-based initiatives in community-based correction practices.

Major Topics:

- A. History and Development of Community Correction
- B. Assessment and Risk Prediction
- C. Role of Practitioner
- D. Legal Liabilities and Risk Management
- E. Specific Aspects Related to Probation
- F. Specific Aspects Related to Parole
- G. Need-based Case Management and Case Planning
- H. Treatment Perspectives
- I. Community-based Residential Treatment Facilities
- J. Intermediate Sanctions
- K. Restorative Offenders
- L. Specialized and Problematic Offender Typologies
- M. Diversity Issues and Cultural Competence

Course Assessments:

- A. **Text/Media.** All text/media is evaluated in the threaded discussions and assignments.
- B. **Threaded Discussions.** The threaded discussions are an opportunity for students to demonstrate their knowledge of the course material and interact with fellow students. Just doing an initial post and/or response will not guarantee any point value. Discussions will be evaluated as follows: a) on the depth of engagement with the discussion topic and/or issue; b) on the depth of understanding of the topic and/or issue; and c) on the depth of interaction with the other students. An initial post is required (evaluation of "a" and "b" above) and then response posts interacting to other students' initial posts (evaluation of "c" above). Once the discussion deadline is reached, there will be no further opportunity to attain points for that discussion. If you have further questions on how these are evaluated, please contact your instructor.
- C. **Unit Assignments.** There is a quiz in each unit in preparation for the Final Exam. More information will be provided in the assignment pages.
- D. **Exams.** There is a Final Exam covering all the course material. More information will be provided in the assignment page.
- E. **Course Project.** There is one course project due. More information will be provided in the assignment page.

Evaluation:

A. Threaded Discussions	220
B. Unit Assignments	480
C. Course Project	100
D. Exams	200

Grading Scale:

The standardized grading scale provides a uniform foundation from which to assess your performance.

Grade	Quality Points per Credit	Score
A	4.0	930 - 1000
A-	3.7	900 - 929
B+	3.3	870 - 899
B	3.0	830 – 869
B-	2.7	800 – 829
C+	2.3	770 – 799
C	2.0	730 – 769
C-	1.7	700 – 729
D+	1.3	670 – 699
D	1.0	600 – 669
F	.0	0 - 599

Letter Grade Equivalencies:

A = Clearly stands out as excellent performance. Has unusually sharp insights into material and initiates thoughtful questions. Sees many sides of an issue. Articulates well and writes logically and clearly. Integrates ideas previously learned from this and other disciplines. Anticipates next steps in progression of ideas. Example "A" work should be of such nature that it could be put on reserve for all cohort members to review and emulate. The "A" cohort member is, in fact, an example for others to follow.

B = Demonstrates a solid comprehension of the subject matter and always accomplishes all course requirements. Serves as an active participant and listener. Communicates orally and in writing at an acceptable level for a cohort member. Work shows intuition and creativity. Example "B" work indicates good quality of performance and is given in recognition for solid work; a "B" should be considered a good grade and awarded to those who submit assignments of quality less than the exemplary work described above.

C = Quality and quantity of work is average. Has average comprehension, communication skills, or initiative. Requirements of the assignments are addressed at least minimally.

D = Quality and quantity of work is below average. Has marginal comprehension, communication skills, or initiative. Requirements of the assignments are addressed at below acceptable levels.

F = Quality and quantity of work is unacceptable and does not qualify the student to progress to a more advanced level of work.

Unit and Time Distribution:

The time to complete each unit is approximately 14-16 hours per week on average for a three hour course. Actual assignment completion times will vary. A more detailed breakdown of each assignment can be found within the course.

POLICIES**Attendance Policy:**

At Lee University student success is directly related to the student actively attending and engaging in the course. Online courses are no different from classroom courses in this regard; however, participation must be defined in a different manner.

Online courses will have weekly mechanisms for student participation, which can be documented by submission/completion of assignments, participation in threaded discussions, and/or specific communication with the instructor as outlined within the syllabus.

Academic Honesty Policy/Information:

Cheating is defined as the use or attempted use of unauthorized materials or receiving unauthorized assistance or communication during any academic exercise.

Examples of cheating include:

- Submitting work for academic evaluation that is not your own.
- Receiving assistance from another person during an examination.
- Using prepared notes or materials during an examination.
- Permitting another student to copy your work.
- Plagiarism.
- Falsification.
- Other misrepresentations of academic achievement submitted for evaluation or a grade.

As stated in the LEE UNIVERSITY Catalog, plagiarism is presenting as your own work the words, ideas, opinions, theories, or thoughts which are not common knowledge. Students who present others' words or ideas as their own without fair attribution (documentation) are guilty of plagiarizing. Unfair attribution includes, but is not limited to, a direct quotation of all or part of another's words without appropriately identifying the source. It is also unfair attribution to have included a source within a Works Cited page without having carefully cited the source within the text of the document.

Plagiarism also includes, but is not limited to, the following acts when performed without fair attribution:

- a. directly quoting all or part of another person's words without quotation marks, as appropriate to the discipline.
- b. paraphrasing all or part of another person's words without documentation.
- c. stating an idea, theory, or formula as your own when it actually originated with another person.
- d. purchasing (or receiving in any other manner) a term paper or other assignment, which is the work of another person, and submitting that work as if it were one's own.

Late Policy:

- No credit is available for postings of any kind made in the **Threaded Discussions** after a given Unit ends.
- If your faculty approves your submission of late assignments, each assignment score will be penalized 10% per day up to five days late. After the fifth day, late assignments will not be accepted. (Note: An assignment is a paper, a project, a team presentation, etc., **not** a discussion.)
- No late assignments will be accepted after the close of the final unit.

EXPECTATIONS**Faculty Expectations of Students:**

- Have consistent access to a computer and possess baseline computer and information skills prior to taking online courses.
- Log into their courses within 24 hours of the beginning of the session to confirm their participation. (Students who register after the session has begun will be responsible for any assignments or material already covered.)
- Take an active role in each unit, participating fully in discussions, assignments and other activities throughout the entire session. If some event interferes with that participation, the student is responsible for notifying the instructor in advance.
- Review the course syllabus and other preliminary course materials thoroughly as early as possible during the first few days of the course.
- Be responsible for raising any questions or seeking clarification about these materials, if necessary, within the first week of the session.
- Frequently check the course calendar for due dates.
- Submit assignments and papers on time, and take tests by the posted dates. Acceptance of late work and any penalties for late submissions are up to the discretion of the instructor, based on the expectations outlined in the course syllabus.
- Contribute meaningful, timely comments to online discussions according to guidelines provided.
- Contribute substantively to group assignments (if required in course).
- Check for University announcements each time you log onto the LMS. These postings are critical.
- Use Lee email address.
- Complete the "Student Survey of Instruction" for each course to evaluate the instructor and the course.

Students' Expectations of Faculty:

- The opportunity to be active participants in a stimulating and challenging education that is global in scope, interactive in process and diverse in content and approach.
- A friendly, respectful, open, and encouraging learning environment.
- A course outline or syllabus that clearly provides information regarding course content, teaching methods, course objectives, grading, attendance/participation policies, due dates, and student assessment guidelines.

- Instructors who are responsive and available to discuss within 48 hours students' progress, course content, assignments, etc. at mutually convenient times from the first day of the session through the last day of the session. (Check the faculty contact information regarding weekends and holidays.)
- Individual instructor's contact information, schedules, availability, and procedural details are located within the course.
- To have access to instructor feedback and grading on projects, exams, papers, quizzes, etc., within ten (10) days of assignment due date so students are able to determine where they have made errors or need additional work.
- Final grade/feedback provided within ten (10) days after the last date of course.

IMPORTANT STUDENT INFORMATION

Special Needs:

Lee University, in conjunction with the Academic Support Office, works to ensure students with documented disabilities have access to educational opportunities. Students who need accommodations based on a disability should visit the Academic Support Office, call (423) 614-8181, or email academicsupport@leeuniversity.edu. It is the student's responsibility to share the Accommodations Form with the instructor in order to initiate the accommodations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Knowledge Base/Working Bibliography (Reading List):

- Alarid, L. F., & Schloss, C. S. (2009). Attorney views on the use of private agencies for probation supervision and treatment. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53(3), 278-291.
- Allen, H. E., and Latessa, E. J. (1980). Corrections in America: 2,000A.D. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 1(4) 1-3.
- Applegate, B.K., Smith, H. P., Sitren, A. H., and Springer, N. F. (2009). From the inside out: The meaning of probation to probationers. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1) 80-95.
- Brank, E., Lane, J., Turner, S., Fain, T., & Sehgal, A. (2008). An experimental juvenile probation program: Effects on parent and peer relationships. *Crime & Delinquency*, 54(2), 193-224.
- Button, D. M., DeMichel, M, and Payne, B.K. (2009). Using electronic monitoring to supervise sex offenders: Legislative patterns and implications for community corrections officers, *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. 20(4) 414-436.
- Cheliotis, L. K., (2008). Before the next storm: Some evidence-based reminders about temporary release. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 53(4) 420-432.
- Craddock, A. (2009). Day reporting center completion: Comparison of individual and multilevel models. *Crime & Delinquency*, 55(1), 105-133.
- Curtis-Fawley, S., Daly, K., (2005). Gendered violence and restorative justice: The views of victim advocates. *Violence Against Women*, 11(5) 603-638.

- Daly, K., (2002). Restorative justice: The real story. *Punishment & Society*, 4(1) 55-79.
- Deering, J. (2010) Attitudes and beliefs of trainee probation officers: A "new breed"? *Probation Journal* 57(1) 9-26.
- Dodgson, K., Goodwin, P., Howard, P. Llevellyn-Thomas, S., Mortimer, E., Russell, N., and Weiner, M. (2001). Electronic monitoring. *Probation Journal*, 48(2) 153.
- Drapela, L. A. (2009). Innovation in community corrections and probation officers' fears of being sued: Implementing neighborhood-based supervision in Spokane, Washington. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 25(4) 364-383.
- Gerkin, P. M. (2008). Participation in victim-offender mediation: Lessons learned from observations. *Criminal Justice Review*, November 24.
- Gould, L. A., Pate, M. and Sarver, M. (2011). Risk and revocation in community corrections: The role of gender. *Probation Journal*, 58(3) 250-264.
- Hirsch, A. (1990). The ethics of community-based sanctions. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36(1), 162-173.
- Hubbard, D. J. & Matthews, B. (2008). Reconciling the differences between the "gender-responsive" and the "what works" literatures to improve services for girls. *Crime & Delinquency*, 54(2), 225-258.
- Kaci, J. H. and Tarrant, S. (1988). Attitudes of prosecutors and probation departments toward diversion in domestic violence cases in California. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 4(3) 187-200.
- Kelly, C. E., & Welsh, W. N. (2008). The predictive validity of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised for drug-involved offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(7), 819-831.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Hubbard, D., Markarios, M. D., & Latessa, E. J. (2009). A quasi-experimental evaluation of thinking for a change: A "real-world" application. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(2), 137-146.
- Lutz, F. E., & Brody, D. C. (1999). Mental abuse as cruel and unusual punishment: Do boot camp prisons violate the Eighth Amendment? *Crime & Delinquency*, 45(2), 242-255.
- Moster, A., Wnuk, D. W., and Jeglic, E. L. (2008). Cognitive behavioral therapy interventions with sex offenders. *Journal of Correctional Health Care*, 14(2) 109-121.
- Newman, D. W. (1995). Jury decision making and the effect of victim impact statements in the penalty phase. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 7(3-4) 291-300.
- Parhar, K. K., Wormith, S. J., Derkzen, D. M., & Beauregard, A. M. (2008). Offender coercion in treatment: A meta-analysis of effectiveness. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(9), 1109-1135.
- Parsonage, W. and Bushey, C. (1987) The victimization of probation and parole workers in the line of duty: an exploratory study. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 2(4) 372-391.
- Perez, D. M., (2009). Applying evidence-based practices to community corrections supervision: An evaluation of residential substance abuse treatment for high-risk probationers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 25(4) 442-458.
- Singer, R. (1978). In favor of "presumptive sentences" set by a sentencing commission. *Crime & Delinquency*, 24(4), 401-427.
- Schlager, M. (2009). The organizational politics of implementing risk assessment instruments in community corrections. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 25(4) 412-423.
- Schlager, M. D., and Pacheco, D., (2011). An examination of changes in LSI-R scores over time: Making the case for needs-base case management. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 38(6) 541-553.
- Sevigny, E. L., Pollack, H. A., and Reuter, P. (2013). Can drug courts help to reduce prison and jail populations? *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 647(1) 190-212.
- Steen, S., & Bandy, R. (2007). When the policy becomes the problem: Criminal justice in the new millennium. *Punishment & Society*, 9(1), 5-26.

- Steen, S., & Opsal, T. (2007). "Punishment on the installment plan": Individual-level predictors of parole revocation in four states. *The Prison Journal*, 87(3), 344-366.
- Stickels, J. (2007). A study of probation revocations for technical violations in Hays County, Texas, USA. *Probation Journal* 54(1) 52-61.
- Swartz, J., (1998). Adapting and using the substance abuse subtle screening inventory-2 with criminal justice offenders: Preliminary results. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 25(3) 344-365.
- Taylor, C. J., (2013). Tolerance of minor setbacks in a challenging reentry experience: An evaluation of a federal reentry court. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 24(1) 49-70.
- Wahl, A. (1966). Federal Probation Belongs with the Courts. *Crime and Delinquency*, 12(4) 371-376.
- Wells, T., Colbert, S., & Slate, R. N. (2006). Gender matters: Differences in state probation officer stress. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 22(1), 63-79.
- Waldron, J.A., and Angelino, H. R., (1997). Shock Probation: a natural experiment on the effect of a short period of incarceration. *The Prison Journal* 57(1) 45-52.
- Warner, T. D., & Kramer, J. H. (2009). Closing the revolving door? Substance abuse treatment as an alternative traditional sentencing for drug-dependent offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(1), 89-109.
- White, M., Mellow, J., Englander, K., and Ruffinengo, M., (2011). Halfway Back: An alternative to revocation for technical parole violators. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 22(2) 140-166.
- Willis, G. M., & Grace, R. C. (2009). Assessment of community reintegration planning for sex offenders: Poor planning predicts recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(5), 494-512.
- Worrall, A. (2000) 'What Works at One Arm Point? A Study in the Transportation of a Penal Concept', *Probation Journal* 47(4): 243 249.
- Worrall, J. (2001). Culpability Standards in Section 1983 Litigation Against Criminal Justice Officials: When and Why Mental State Matters. *Crime and Delinquency* 47(1) 28-59.
- Van Nijnatten, C., and Stevens, G. (2011). Juvenile participation in conversations with probation officers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 56(3) 483-499.
- Ventura, L. A., and Davis, G. (2005). Domestic Violence: Court case conviction and recidivism. *Violence Against Women*, 11(2) 255-277.