

# **CRM 771: CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

**Professor:** Ethan Amidon, Ph.D.

**Office:** Strong Hall 230A

**Office Hours:** 10 am – 2 pm (Tues - Thurs) or by appointment

**Email:** [EthanAmidon@MissouriState.edu](mailto:EthanAmidon@MissouriState.edu)

**Phone:** 417-836-3133

## **Course Description**

This course examines modern issues, problems, and practices facing the community corrections profession. A special emphasis is placed on (1) examining the major contemporary themes and issues present within community-based corrections, (2) presenting the conceptual debates and controversies surrounding certain community-based correctional programs, (3) covering the current research on community-based correctional programs and their effectiveness, and (4) exploring the challenges of interacting with specific types of offender populations, including drug, mentally ill, domestic violence, gang, and sex offenders, in treatment and community contexts.

## **Student Learning Outcomes & Methods of Assessment**

The core objectives of this course are described by the following goals and learning objectives. Students who complete this course should be able to:

1. Demonstrate a mastery of the various purposes of community-based corrections (basic goals and practice).
2. Critically analyze contemporary community correctional policies.
3. Articulate the costs and benefits of community-based sanctions for offenders.
4. Describe classification techniques and understand the importance of classification for the level of supervision and development of a treatment plan.
5. Understand the challenges that reentry, probation, and parole pose for offenders.
6. Articulate the challenges that officers encounter when supervising offenders.
7. Analyze the issues inherent in the supervision and treatment of drug, mental health, domestic violence, gang, and sex offenders.

All of these learning objectives will be assessed using review questions, discussion assignments, exams, and the final paper.

## **Optional Materials**

There will be one ***optional*** textbook associated with this course. Students who would like a refresher on the core concepts associated with community corrections policies and practices should consider purchasing the following textbook:

**Alarid, L.F. 2012. *Community-Based Corrections* (11<sup>th</sup> edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth-Cengage.**

**\*\*\*Additional required readings and articles will be assigned throughout the course and will be provided by the professor on Blackboard.**

## Grading

Your final grade for this class will be based on your performance on two exams, one final paper, twelve weekly review questions, and eleven discussion assignments. The breakdown of your final grade is as follows:

2 Exams	200 points
1 Final Paper	100 points
12 Weekly Review Questions	60 points
11 Discussion Assignments	165 points
Total	525 points

**Exams (~38%):** There will be two essay exams worth 100 points each given throughout the course. These exams will consist of material covered in the assigned readings, review questions, and discussion assignments. Exams will be posted on the Sunday before the week they are assigned, and they will be due the following **Sunday by midnight**.

**Final Paper (~20%):** The final paper assignment will be due by **midnight on MAY 14<sup>TH</sup>**. This assignment will require students to select one question from a predetermined list of paper topics and to write a 15-20 page paper on their selected topic. Students will be required to consult a minimum of **10 scholarly sources** when completing this paper. Students will also be expected to turn in a short one-page summary of their topic by **midnight on MARCH 12<sup>TH</sup>**. The one-page summary is worth 10% of your overall grade on the paper assignment (i.e., one letter grade).

**Weekly Review Questions (~11%):** Students will be expected to complete a series of review questions that are associated with the assigned readings for each of the weekly topics. These review questions will be made available on **Mondays**, and students will be expected to post their answers to the appropriate discussion board by **midnight on Sundays**. Each student will be assigned 2-4 questions per weekly topic, but the exact number of questions may vary from week to week. These review questions will be graded in terms of: **1)** whether the student thoroughly addresses all aspects related to their assigned questions, **2)** the student demonstrates their understanding of the assigned readings and conveys their answers using their own words (while the use of short quotes (i.e., 1-2 sentences) is acceptable, the inclusion of long block quotes will not be accepted as an appropriate response), and **3)** the clarity of the student's response (i.e., whether the student clearly articulates their point using proper punctuation and grammar). All exam questions will be drawn from these weekly review questions; the posted answers to these questions will be helpful when preparing for examinations. Responses to the review questions will be worth 5 points per week.

**Discussion Assignments (~31%):** There will be the opportunity to complete 12 discussion assignments worth 15 points each throughout the semester. These discussion assignments will coincide with each of the weekly topics, and students will be graded in terms of **their performance on 11 of these assignments**. Student grades on these assignments will be based on two components. **First**, students will be required to write a 2-3 page response to a **predetermined** question or scenario associated with the scheduled readings for that week. Student performance on these papers will be **generally graded** in terms of: **1)** the clarity of the student's response (i.e., whether the student clearly articulates their point using proper

punctuation and grammar), **2)** whether the student has incorporated information **from all of the assigned weekly readings**, **3)** the correct identification and application of the core community corrections concepts covered in the course, **4)** the quality of the justifications offered for their position, and **5)** the overall thoughtfulness of the student's response. Additional grading expectations may be included with the weekly instructions for these papers. The weekly discussion question or scenario will be posted on the **Monday** the topic is scheduled to be covered, and students will be expected to post their papers on the appropriate discussion board **by midnight on Sunday**.

**Second**, students will be expected to read and respond to at **least two other students' discussion postings**. Student responses will **generally be graded** in terms of: **1)** the correct identification and application of the core community corrections concepts covered in the course, **2)** the quality of the justifications offered for their position, and **3)** the overall thoughtfulness of the student's response (i.e., merely saying I agree or disagree is not an appropriate response). Student responses to discussion postings will be due by **midnight on Wednesdays** (i.e., students will have three full days to post both of their responses). The initial posting to the discussion board will be worth 10 points, and responses to two other students' postings will be worth 5 points. If students choose to complete all 12 of the discussion assignments, their lowest grade on one of these assignments will be dropped.

**Make-up Policy and Late Assignments:** Make-up exams or the acceptance of late assignments will only be given/accepted in emergency situations and only when the student has received permission from me prior to the due date. If an emergency situation should arise, please contact me via email before the assignment/exam/paper scheduled due date. **Students who fail to notify me before the due date will not be allowed to make up the course work.**

**The grading scale for this class is as follows:**

A	= 90% - 100%
B	= 80% - 89%
C	= 70% - 79%
F	= Below 70%

### **Course Policies and Expectations**

As noted above, purchasing and completing the readings contained within the *Alarid* textbook is **optional** for students who would like to review the core concepts associated with the supervision of offenders in the community. In addition to these chapters, I will post PowerPoint slides on Blackboard that highlight the key concepts covered in each of the suggested *Alarid* chapters. Even if students decide not to purchase the textbook, I highly suggest reviewing these PowerPoint slides before covering the required readings for each section. Furthermore, I have included suggested readings in the course schedule below. While students will not be required to integrate these readings into their weekly discussion responses, the suggested supplemental readings will likely prove to be beneficial for students who would like a general overview or more information on each scheduled topic.

**Students will be responsible for ensuring their ability to access and complete all of the requirements associated with this course.** In order to perform well in this class, students will likely need to access Blackboard on a daily basis. **It is the responsibility of the student to make sure they will be able to frequently access a computer with Internet capabilities throughout the semester.** Furthermore, if technical difficulties should arise, students will be expected to actively address these issues by contacting the **help desk (417-836-5891)** and myself (via email, phone, or during office hours) for assistance with these problems. **Missing submission dates based on either of these issues will rarely be excused.**

Finally, it is expected that students will demonstrate respect for their fellow classmates' views and opinions. This means avoiding the use of abusive, harassing, or insulting language towards other students. One of the goals of this class is to create a collaborative environment in which students are able to communicate with one another to increase their knowledge of the course material. In order to attain this goal, we must all strive to be respectful of each other and to create an atmosphere that encourages student participation and discussion.

### **Non-Discrimination Policy**

Missouri State University is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution and maintains a grievance procedure available to any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against. At all times, it is your right to address inquiries or concerns about possible discrimination to the [Office for Equity and Diversity](#), Park Central Office Building, 117 Park Central Square, Suite 111, (417) 836-4252. Other types of concerns (i.e., concerns of an academic nature) should be discussed directly with your professor and can also be brought to the attention of your professor's Department Head. Please visit the OED website at [www.missouristate.edu/equity/](http://www.missouristate.edu/equity/).

### **Students with Disabilities**

To request academic accommodations for a disability, contact the Director of the [Disability Resource Center](#), Plaster Student Union, Suite 405, (417) 836-4192 or (417) 836-6792 (TTY), [www.missouristate.edu/disability](http://www.missouristate.edu/disability). Students are required to provide documentation of disability to the Disability Resource Center prior to receiving accommodations. The Disability Resource Center refers some types of accommodation requests to the [Learning Diagnostic Clinic](#), which also provides diagnostic testing for learning and psychological disabilities. For information about testing, contact the Director of the [Learning Diagnostic Clinic](#), (417) 836-4787, <http://psychology.missouristate.edu/ldc>.

### **Academic Dishonesty**

Missouri State University is a community of scholars committed to developing educated persons who accept the responsibility to practice personal and academic integrity. You are responsible for knowing and following the university's student honor code, *Student Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures*, available at [www.missouristate.edu/assets/provost/AcademicIntegrityPolicyRev-1-08.pdf](http://www.missouristate.edu/assets/provost/AcademicIntegrityPolicyRev-1-08.pdf) and also available at the Reserves Desk in Meyer Library. Any student participating in any form of

academic dishonesty will be subject to sanctions as described in this policy. Any student caught cheating or plagiarizing will receive zero points for the assignment.

### **Cell Phone Policy (Required)**

Finally, as a member of the learning community, each student has a responsibility to other students who are members of the community. When cell phones or pagers ring and students respond in class or leave class to respond, it disrupts the class. Therefore, the [Office of the Provost](#) prohibits the use by students of cell phones, pagers, PDAs, or similar communication devices during scheduled classes. All such devices must be turned off or put in a silent (vibrate) mode and ordinarily should not be taken out during class. Given the fact that these same communication devices are an integral part of the University's emergency notification system, an exception to this policy would occur when numerous devices activate simultaneously. When this occurs, students may consult their devices to determine if a university emergency exists. If that is not the case, the devices should be immediately returned to silent mode and put away. Other exceptions to this policy may be granted at the discretion of the professor.

### **Emergency Response Statement**

For information about emergency response policies at Missouri State University, please review this link: <http://www.missouristate.edu/safetran/51597.htm> and <http://www.missouristate.edu/safetran/erp.htm>.

### **Course Outline**

**\*\*\*Please note, for the purposes of the course schedule, each week will begin on Monday and end at midnight on Sunday.**

#### **WEEK 1 (1/16 – 1/22): INTRODUCTION TO THE COURSE**

#### **WEEK 2 (1/23 – 1/29): COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS STRATEGIES & THE BROADER SOCIAL CONTEXT**

Jacobson, Michael. 2006. *Downsizing Prisons: How to Reduce Crime and End Mass Incarceration*. New York: New York University Press. Chapter 1.

Feeley, Malcolm M. and Jonathan Simon. 1992. The New Penology: Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and Its Implications. *Criminology* 30:449-74.

Lutze, Faith E. 2014. *Professional Lives of Community Corrections Officers: The Invisible Side of Reentry*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications. Chapter 1.

#### **Supplemental Readings:**

*Alarid: Chapter 1*

Kleiman, Mark A.R. 1999. Community Corrections as the Front Line in Crime Control. *UCLA Law Review* 46:1909-25.

### **WEEK 3 (1/30 – 2/5): PROBATION & PAROLE**

- Lynch, Mona. 1998. Waste Managers? The New Penology, Crime Fighting, and Parole Agent Identity. *Law & Society Review* 32:839-70.
- Skeem, Jennifer L. and Sarah Manchak. 2008. Back to the Future: From Klockars' Model of Effective Supervision to Evidence-Based Practice in Probation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 47:220-47.
- Taxman, Faye S. 2008. No Illusions: Offender and Organizational Change in Maryland's Proactive Community Supervision Efforts. *Criminology and Public Policy* 7:275-302.

#### **Supplemental Readings:**

- Alarid: Chapters 2 & 3*
- Petersilia, Joan. 1997. Probation in the United States. *Crime and Justice* 22:149-200.
- Scott-Hayward, Christine. 2011. The Failure of Parole: Rethinking the Role of the State in Reentry. *New Mexico Law Review* 41:421-65.

### **WEEK 4 (2/6 – 2/12): PRETRIAL & SENTENCING**

- Rosecrance, John. 1988. Maintaining the Myth of Individualized Justice: Probation Presentence Reports. *Justice Quarterly* 5:235-56.
- Davis, Robert C. and Barbara E. Smith. 1994. The Effects of Victim Impact Statements on Sentencing Decisions: A Test in an Urban Setting. *Justice Quarterly* 11:453-69.
- Goldkamp, John S. and Michael D. White. 2006. Restoring Accountability in Pretrial Release: The Philadelphia Pretrial Release Supervision Experiments. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 2:143-81.

#### **Supplemental Readings:**

- Alarid: Chapter 4*
- Stinchcomb, Jeanne B. and Daryl Hippensteel. 2001. Presentence Investigation Reports: A Relevant Justice Model Tool or a Medical Model Relic? *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 12:164-77.

### **WEEK 5 (2/13 – 2/19): RISK ASSESSMENT & CLASSIFICATION**

- Bonta, James. 2002. Offender Risk Assessment: Guidelines for Selection and Use. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 29:355-79.
- Rettinger, L. Jill and D. A. Andrews. 2010. General Risk and Need, Gender Specificity, and the Recidivism of Female Offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 37:29-46.
- Viglione, Jill, Danielle S. Rudes, and Faye S. Taxman. 2015. Misalignment in Supervision: Implementing Risk/Needs Assessment Instruments in Probation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 42:1-24.

#### **Supplemental Readings:**

- Alarid: Chapter 5*
- Lowenkamp, Christopher T., Edward J. Latessa, and Alexander M. Holsinger. 2006. The Risk Principle in Action: What Have We Learned from 13,676 Offenders and 97 Correctional Programs? *Crime & Delinquency* 52:77-93.

## **WEEK 6 (2/20 – 2/26): INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS**

- Duwe, Grant and Deborah Kerschner. 2005. Removing a Nail from the Boot Camp Coffin: An Outcome Evaluation of Minnesota's Challenge Incarceration Program. *Crime & Delinquency* 54:614-43.
- Renzema, Marc and Evan Mayo-Wilson. 2005. Can Electronic Monitoring Reduce Crime for Moderate to High-risk Offenders? *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 1:215-37.
- Paparozzi, Mario A. and Paul Gendreau. 2005. An Intensive Supervision Program That Worked: Service Delivery, Professional Orientation, and Organizational Supportiveness. *The Prison Journal* 85:445-66.

### **Supplemental Readings:**

- Alarid: Chapters 8 & 9*
- Tonry, Michael and Mary Lynch. 1996. Intermediate Sanctions. *Crime and Justice* 20:99-144.

## **WEEK 7 (2/27 – 3/5): PRISONER REENTRY**

- Bahr, Stephen J., Lish Harris, James K. Fisher, and Anita Harker Armstrong. 2010. Successful Reentry: What Differentiates Successful and Unsuccessful Parolees? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 54:667-92.
- Spjeldnes, Solveig and Sara Goodkind. 2009. Gender Differences and Offender Reentry: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 48:314-35.
- Hipp, John R., Joan Petersilia, and Susan Turner. 2010. Parolee Recidivism in California: The Effect of Neighborhood Context and Social Service Agency Characteristics. *Criminology* 48:947-79.
- Seiter, Richard P. and Karen R. Kadela. 2003. Prisoner Reentry: What Works, What Does Not, and What Is Promising. *Crime and Delinquency* 49:360-88

### **Supplemental Readings:**

- Alarid: Chapter 11*
- Visher, Christy A. and Jeremy Travis. 2003. Transitions from Prison to Community: Understanding Individual Pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:89-113.

## **WEEK 8 (3/6 – 3/12): FOCAL CONCERNS OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS OFFICERS**

### **PAPER SUMMARY DUE BY MIDNIGHT ON SUNDAY, MARCH 12<sup>TH</sup>**

- West, Angela and Richard Seiter. 2004. Social Worker or Cop? Measuring the Supervision Styles of Probation and Parole Officers in Kentucky and Missouri. *Journal of Crime and Justice* 27:27-57.
- Drapela, Laurie A. and Faith E. Lutze. 2009. Innovation in Community Corrections and Probation Officers' Fears of Being Sued: Implementing Neighborhood-Based Supervision in Spokane, Washington. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 25:364-83.
- Slate, Risdon N., Terry L. Wells and Wesley Johnson. 2003. Opening the Manager's

Door: State Probation Officer Stress and Perceptions of Participation in Workplace Decision Making. *Crime & Delinquency* 49:519-41.  
Lowry, Kevin D. 2000. United States Probation/Pretrial Officers' Concerns About Victimization and Officer Safety Training. *Federal Probation* 64:51-5

**Supplemental Readings:**

*Alarid: Chapter 12*

**WEEK 9 (3/13 – 3/19): NO CLASS: SPRING BREAK**

**WEEK 10 (3/20 – 3/26): EXAM I**

**WEEK 11 (3/27 – 4/2): DRUG OFFENDERS**

Marlowe, Douglas B. 2011. Evidence-Based Policies and Practices for Drug Involved Offenders. *Prison Journal* 91:27-47.  
Blenko, Steven. 2006. Assessing Released Inmates for Substance-Abuse-Related Needs. *Crime & Delinquency* 52:94-113.  
Mitchell, Ojmarrh, David B. Wilson, Amy Eggers, and Doris L. MacKenzie. 2012. Assessing the Effectiveness of Drug Courts on Recidivism: A Meta-analytic Review of the Traditional and Non-traditional Drug Courts. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 40:60-71.

**Supplemental Readings:**

*Alarid: Chapter 6*

Hser, Yih-Ing, Douglas Longshore, and M. Douglas Anglin. 2007. The Life Course Perspective on Drug Use: A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Drug Use Trajectories. *Evaluation Review* 31:515-47.

**WEEK 12 (4/3 – 4/9): MENTALLY ILL OFFENDERS**

Baillargeon, Jacques, Stephen K. Hoge, and Joseph V. Penn. 2010. Addressing the Challenges of Community Reentry Among Released Inmates With Serious Mental Illness. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 46:361-75.  
Skeem, Jennifer L., Sarah Manchak, and Jillian K. Peterson. 2011. Correctional Policy for Offenders with Mental Illness: Creating a New Paradigm for Recidivism Reduction. *Law and Human Behavior* 35:110-26.  
Chandler, Redonna K., Roger H. Peters, Gary Field, and Denise Juluano-Bult. 2004. Challenges in Implementing Evidence-Based Treatment Practices for Co-occurring Disorders in the Criminal Justice System. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 22:431-48.  
Louden, Jennifer Eno and Jennifer Skeem. 2012. Do Probation Officers Assess and Manage Recidivism and Risk for Probationers With Mental Disorder? An Experimental Investigation. *Law and Human Behavior* 37:22-34.

**Supplemental Readings:**

*Alarid: Chapter 6*

Redlich, Allison D. et al. 2005. The Second Generation of Mental Health Courts. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 11:527-38.



### **WEEK 13 (4/10 – 4/16): DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDERS**

- Henning, Kris, Angela Jones, and Robert Holdford. 2003. Treatment Needs of Women Arrested for Domestic Violence: A Comparison with Male Offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18:839-56.
- Walker, Kate, Erica Bowen, Sarah Brown, and Emma Sleath. 2015. Desistance from Intimate Partner Violence: A Conceptual Model and Framework for Practitioners for Managing the Process of Change. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 30:1-25.
- Babcock, Julia C. Charles E. Green, and Chet Robie. 2004. Does Batterers' Treatment Work? A Meta-Analytic Review of Domestic Violence Treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review* 24:1023-53.

#### **Supplemental Readings:**

*Alarid: Chapter 6*

- Cavanaugh, Mary M. and Richard J. Gelles. 2005. The Utility of Male Domestic Violence Offender Typologies: New Directions for Research, Policy, and Practice. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 20:155-66.

### **WEEK 14 (4/17 – 4/23): GANG OFFENDERS**

- Pyrooz, David C., Scott H. Decker, and Vincent J. Webb. 2010. The Ties That Bind: Desistance From Gangs. *Crime & Delinquency* 60:491-516.
- Fleisher, Mark S. and Scott H. Decker. 2001. Going Home, Staying Home: Integrating Prison Gang Members into the Community. *Corrections Management Quarterly* 5:65-77.
- Braga, Anthony A., Anne M. Piehl, and David Hureau. 2008. *Controlling Violent Offenders Released to the Community: An Evaluation of the Boston Reentry Initiative*. Cambridge: Harvard Kennedy School.

#### **Supplemental Readings:**

*Alarid: Chapter 6*

- Decker, Scott H., Chris Melde, and David Pyrooz. 2013. What do we Know About Gangs and Gang Members and Where Do We Go From Here? *Justice Quarterly* 30:369-402.

### **WEEK 15 (4/24 – 4/30): SEX OFFENDERS**

- Hanson, R. Karl, Kelly E. Morton, and Andrew J. R. Harris. 2006. Sexual Offender Recidivism Risk: What we Know and What we Need to Know. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 989:154-66.
- Levenson, Jill S., Yolanda N. Brannon, Timothy Fortney, and Juanita Baker. 2007. Public Perceptions About Sex Offenders and Community Protection Policies. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* 7:1-25.
- Tewksbury, Richard. 2005. Collateral Consequences of Sex Offender Registration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 21:67-81.
- Losel, Friedrich and Martin Schmucker. 2005. The Effectiveness of Treatment for Sexual Offenders: A Comprehensive Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 1:117-46.

**Supplemental Readings:**

*Alarid: Chapter 6*

Robertiello, Gina and Karen J. Terry. 2007. Can we Profile Sex Offenders? A Review of Sex Offender Typologies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 12:508-18.

**WEEK 16 (5/1 – 5/7): EXAM II**

**WEEK 17 (5/8 – 5/14): FINAL PAPERS DUE BY MIDNIGHT ON SUNDAY, MAY 14<sup>TH</sup>**