LEE UNIVERSITY

Division of Adult Learning

DIVISION OF ADULT LEARNING

SYLLABUS

SOCI-380: JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Date: 04/22/2019

Table of Contents:

University Mission Statement:

Lee University is a Christian institution which offers liberal arts and professional education on both the baccalaureate 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 an examination of delinquent behavior and the general operation of the juvenile control system.

Required Text(s) and/or Supporting Resources:

Required Text:
Siegel, L. J & Welsh, B. C. (2012). Juvenile delinquency, theory, practice and law (13 Ed.). Wadsworth: Cengage Learning. (*Provided as a link in the course and charged to your Lee account as "Book Bundle" fee. A loose-leaf book is available to purchase through the Lee bookstore.)*

Additional Supporting Resources:
Resources included in the Learning Management System (LMS).

Prerequisite Skills and Knowledge:

SOCI-200

Course Goals and Learning Outcomes:

PURPOSE
This course surveys theories that explain different types of juvenile delinquency. The course examines the causes and issues surrounding delinquency in the form of violence, school shootings, gang membership, drug use, and running away. The course examines institutions designed to manage and control young offenders.

General Learning Objectives (*Course Goals*):
This course seeks to:
1. Familiarize student with the different sociological theories and concepts regarding delinquency.
2. Help students to understand how these theories can help interpret the problem of delinquency in society.
3. Facilitate discussion to critically link social structures, social forces and individual circumstances in understanding juvenile delinquency.

Specific Behavioral Objectives (*Learning Outcomes*):
As a result of the activities and study in this course, the student should be able to:
1. Distinguish the differences between the concept of delinquency and childhood.
2. Explore the nature and extent of delinquency in American setting.

3. Examine the different ways how delinquency is explained by theorists and scientists at the individual, structural, reactionary, social inequality, and developmental perspectives.
4. Examine different types of delinquency and review some research regarding its intersection with gender, family, peers, race, class, gangs, school, drug use, and other forms of violence.
5. Focus on how the juvenile justice system responds to the problem of delinquency and look at some of the legal and ethical debates stemming from such practices.
6. Review current research on juvenile delinquency.

Major Topics:

A. The Concept of Delinquency
B. Theories of Delinquency
C. Social, Community, and Environmental Influences on Delinquency
D. The Juvenile Justice System

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.** The student will watch Video Case and answer questions when prompted. These assignments will be completed in the MindTap platform (via the textbook link).
D. **Course Project.** There will be You Decide activities to do in each unit. These items will be completed in the MindTap platform (via the textbook link).
E. **Exams.** Each unit has an exam covering the content from that unit.

Evaluation:

A. Threaded Discussions   230
B. Unit Assignments   140
C. Course Project   280
D. Exams   350

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 14-17 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):

Bazemore, G., and Umbreit, M. (1995) Rethinking the sanctioning function in juvenile court: Retributive or restorative responses to youth crime. Crime and Delinquency, 41(3): 296-316.

Bernard, T. J. (1992). The cycle of juvenile justice. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Bernard, T.J. (1999) Juvenile crime and the transformation of juvenile justice: Is there a juvenile crime wave? Justice Quarterly, 16(2): 337-356.

Bishop, Donna M., and Frazier, C. E. (1992) gender bias in juvenile justice processing: Implications for the JJDP Act. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 82: 1162-1186.

Bishop, Donna M., and Frazier, C. E. (1988) The influence of race in juvenile justice processing. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 25(2): 242-263.

Black, Donald J., and Reiss, A. J. (1970) Police control of juveniles. American Sociological Review 35: 63-77.

Blumstein, A. (1995) Youth violence, guns, and the illicit-drug industry. The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 86(1): 10-36.

Chambliss, W. J. (1973) The saints and the roughnecks. Society, 11: 24-31

Chesney-Lind, M., and Sheldon, R.G. (2004) Girls, delinquency and juvenile justice. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. (3 rd Ed).

Decker, S. H., and Van Winkle, B. (1996) Life in the gang: Family, friends and, violence. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fagan, J., and Zimring, F. E. (Eds). (2000) The changing borders of juvenile justice: Transfer of adolescents to the criminal court. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Feld, B. C. (1999) Bad kids: Race and the transformation of the juvenile court. New York: Oxford University Press.

Finckenauer, J. O., and Gaven, P.W. (1999) Scared straight and the panacea phenomenon revisited. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Frazier, C. E., Bishop, D.M., and Lanza-Kaduce, L. (1999). Get tough juvenile justice reforms: the florida experience." ANNALS, 564:167-184.

Fritsch, E., and Hemmens, C. (1995) Juvenile waiver in the US 1979-1995: A comparison and analysis of state waiver statutes. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 46(3): 17-35.

Hagan, J., Gillis, A.R., and Simpson, J. (1985) The class structure of gender and delinquency: Toward a power-control theory of common delinquent behavior. American Journal of Sociology, 90(6): 1151-1178. 30

Hirschi, T., and Gottfredson, M. (1993) Rethinking the juvenile justice system. Crime and delinquency, 39(2): 262-271.

Howell, James C et al. (1995). Serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders: A sourcebook. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Klein, M. W. (1995) The American street gang: Its nature, prevalence, and control. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lipsey, M. W. (1992) Juvenile delinquency treatment: A meta-analytic inquiry into the variability of effects. Pp. 83-127 in T.D.

Cook et al. (Eds.), Meta-Analysis for explanation: A casebook. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. P. (1999). Serious & violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCord, J. (2003) Cures that harm: Unanticipated outcomes of crime prevention programs. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 587: 16-30.

McCord, J. (1991) Family relationships, juvenile delinquency, and adult criminality. Criminology, 29(3): 397-417.

McCord, J., Spatz Widom, C., and Crowell, N.A. (Eds). (2001) Juvenile crime, juvenile justice. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press. (National Research Council.)

Mears, D. P., and Travis, J. (2004) The dimensions, pathways and consequences of youth reentry. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute. (Available to download as .pdf from www.urban.org).

Mihalic, S., Fagan, A., Irwin, K., Ballard, D., and Elliott, D. (2004) Blueprints for violence prevention. NCJ 204274. Available at www.ncjrs.org

Miller, J. (1998) Last one over the wall: The Massachusetts experiment in closing reform schools (2nd ed). Ohio State University Press.

Miller, J., Maxson, C.L., and Klein, M.W. (2001) The modern gang reader (2nd ed). Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Moore, M., and Wakeling, S. (1997) Juvenile justice: Shoring up the foundations. Pp 253-302 in M. Tonry (Ed.), Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Volume 22. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Platt, A. M. (1977) The child savers: The invention of delinquency. 2 nd Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reed, W. L., and Decker, S.H. (Eds.). (2002) Responding to gangs: Evaluation and research. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. NCJ 190351 Available at www.ncjrs.org (Note: This is a book, you might want to order a hard copy).

Sampson, R., and Laub, J. (1993) Structural variation in juvenile court processing: Inequality, the underclass and social control. Law and Society Review, 27(2): 285-311. 31

Siegel, L. J., Welsh, B.C., and Senna, J. (latest edition) Juvenile delinquency: Theory, practice and law. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth (this is a textbook, for a general overview). Streib, V. (regularly updated). The Juvenile Death Penalty Today. Available at: http://www.law.onu.edu/faculty/streib/juvdeath.htm

Tonry, M., and Moore, M.H. (Eds.). (1998). Youth violence (Volume 24, Crime and Justice: A Review of Research). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Travis, J., and Waul, M. (Eds). (2004) Prisoners once removed: The Impact of incarceration on children, families and communities. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute.

Widom, C.S., and Maxfield, M.G. (2001) An update on the cycle of violence. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice. Available at www.ncjrs.org NCJ 184894.

Winner, L., Lanza-Kaduce, L., Bishop, D.M., and Frazier, C.E. (1997) the transfer of juveniles to criminal court: Reexamining recidivism over the long term. Crime & Delinquency, 43(4): 548- 563.

Zimring, F. (1998) American youth violence. New York: Oxford University Press.