

	Course	CRIM 7315: Evidence-Based Crime Prevention
	Professor	John L. Worrall, Ph.D.
	Term	Spring 2020
	Meetings	Through March 11: W 4:00 p.m.-6:45 p.m., CB 1.102 4/1, 4/15, 4/22, 4/29: Via Blackboard Collaborate

Professor's Contact Information

Office Phone	(972) 883-4893
Other Phone	N/A
Office Location	GR 2.126
Email Address	worrall@utdallas.edu
Office Hours	W 2:00 p.m. – 3:45 p.m and by appointment

General Course Information

Course Description	This course explores relationships between crime policy and empirical evaluation research. Students will learn to critically analyze empirical evidence regarding specific criminal justice and crime-related policies, identify factors that influence policymaking, and describe challenges associated with evaluation research of crime-focused programs.
Learning Objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understand crime prevention policies and strategies. 2. Distinguish between varieties of crime prevention evaluations. 3. Develop skills in assessing program effectiveness. 4. Critically analyze empirical evidence regarding crime and criminal justice policies and programs. 5. Develop advanced skills in professional communication appropriate to audiences in academia, government, or nongovernmental agencies.
Required Readings	Required readings appear below in the “Academic Calendar” section. All are accessible through the library’s website. Please read the material <i>prior</i> to attending class.

Academic Calendar (subject to change with fair notice).

January 15	Introduction
January 22	<p>CrimeSolutions.gov Overview and Exercise Review of Research Methods</p> <p>Readings:</p> <p>Dominquez, Patricio & Raphael, Steven. (2015). The role of the cost-of-crime literature in bridging the gap between social science research and policy making. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 14, 589-632.</p> <p>Loughran, Thomas A., Wilson, Theodore, Nagin, Daniel S., & Piquero, Alex R. (2015). Evolutionary regression? Assessing the problem of hidden bias in criminal justice applications using propensity scores. <i>Journal of Experimental Criminology</i>, 11, 631-652.</p> <p>Pratt, Travis C. (2010a). Special issue on quantitative methods for criminal justice and criminology. <i>Journal of Criminal Justice Education</i>, 21(2), 103-4.</p>

	<p>Pratt, Travis C. (2010b). Meta-Analysis in Criminal Justice and Criminology: What it is, when it's useful, and what to watch out for. <i>Journal of Criminal Justice Education</i>, 21(2), 152-168.</p> <p>Roman, John. (2013). Cost-benefit analysis of criminal justice reforms. <i>NIJ Journal</i>, 272. http://www.nij.gov/journals/272/Pages/cost-benefit.aspx</p> <p>Shadish, William R. (2013). Propensity score analysis: Promise, reality and irrational exuberance. <i>Journal of Experimental Criminology</i>, 9(2), 129-144.</p> <p>Welsh, Brandon C., Farrington, David P., & Gower, B. Raffan. (2015). Benefit-cost analysis of crime prevention programs. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 44, 447-516. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.</p>
<p>January 29</p>	<p>Evaluating Crime Prevention</p> <p>Readings:</p> <p>Fagan, Abigail A., & Buchanan, Molly. (2016). What works in crime prevention?: Comparison and critical review of three crime prevention registries. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 15, 617-650.</p> <p>Farrington, David P., Gottfredson, Denise C., Sherman, Lawrence W., & Welsh, Brandon (2002). The Maryland Scientific Methods Scale. In L.W. Sherman, D.P. Farrington, B.C. Welsh, and D.L. MacKenzie (Eds.), <i>Evidence-Based Crime Prevention</i> (pp. 13-21). New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Farrington, David P., Friedrich Losel, Robert F. Boruch, Denise C. Gottfredson, Lorraine Mazerolle, Lawrence W. Sherman, and David Weisburd. (2019). Advancing knowledge about replication in criminology. <i>Journal of Experimental Criminology</i>, 15, 373-96.</p> <p>MacKenzie, Doris L., & Farrington, David P. (2015). Preventing future offending of delinquents and offenders: What have we learned from experiments and meta-analyses? <i>Journal of Experimental Criminology</i>, 11, 565-595.</p> <p>Sampson, Robert J. (2010). Gold standard myths: Observations on the experimental turn in quantitative criminology. <i>Journal of Quantitative Criminology</i>, 26, 489-500.</p> <p>Sherman, Lawrence W., Gottfredson, Denise C., MacKenzie, Doris L., Eck, John, Reuter, Peter, & Bushway, Shawn D. (1998). Preventing Crime: What works, what doesn't what's promising. <i>National Institute of Justice Research in Brief</i>. https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/171676.PDF</p> <p>Weisburd, David. (2010). Justifying the use of non-experimental methods and disqualifying the use of randomized controlled trials: Challenging folklore in evaluation research in crime and justice. <i>Journal of Experimental Criminology</i>, 6, 209-227.</p> <p>Weisburd, David, Farrington, David P., & Gill, Charlotte. (2017). What works in crime prevention and rehabilitation: An assessment of systematic reviews. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 16, 415-450.</p>

February 5	Exam 1
February 12	<p>Getting the Message Out</p> <p>Readings:</p> <p>Huff, C. Ronald. (2016). Research with considerations of use: Problem-driven research and attempts to improve public policy and practice. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 15(4), 5–15.</p> <p>Mears, Daniel P. (2010). The role of research and researchers in crime and justice policy. <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, 9(4), 799-805.</p> <p>Obama, Barack. (2017). Commentary: The President’s Role in Advancing Criminal Justice Reform. <i>Harvard Law Review</i>, 130, 811-866.</p> <p>Piquero, Alex R. (2019). Nothing fake here: The public criminology case for being smart on crime by being smarter on people. <i>Justice Evaluation Journal</i>, 2(1), 73-92.</p> <p>Rodriguez, Nancy. (2018). Expanding the evidence base in criminology and criminal justice: Barriers and opportunities to bridging research and practice. <i>Justice Evaluation Journal</i>, 1(1), 1-14.</p> <p>Stevenson, Philip, Katz, Charles, & Decker, Scott H. (2013). The foundation of an evidence-based justice system: The need for meaningful academic and applied researcher partnerships. <i>Translational Criminology</i>, Fall, 22-25.</p> <p>Tonry, Michael. (2010). Public criminology and evidence-based policy. <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, 9(4), 783-797.</p> <p>Welsh, Brandon C., & Farrington, David P. (2012). Science, politics, and crime prevention: Toward a new crime policy. <i>Journal of Criminal Justice</i>, 40, 128-133.</p>
February 19	<p>Police Interventions</p> <p>Readings:</p> <p>Braga, Anthony A., Papachristos, Andrew V., & Hureau, David M. (2014). The effects of hot spots policing on crime: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Justice Quarterly</i>, 31(4), 633-663.</p> <p>Braga, Anthony A., David L. Weisburd, & Brandon Turchan (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 17(1), 205-50.</p> <p>Lee, YongJei, Eck, John E., & Corsaro, Nicholas. (2016). Conclusions from the history of research into the effects of police force size on crime—1968 through 2013: A historical systematic review. <i>Journal of Experimental Criminology</i>, 12, 431-451.</p> <p>Lum, Cynthia, Megan Stolz, Christopher S. Koper, and J. Amber Scherer. (2019). Research on body-worn cameras: What we know, what we need to know. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 18(1), 93-118.</p> <p>Rosenfeld, Richard, & Joel Wallman. (2019). Did de-policing cause the increase</p>

	<p>in homicide rates? <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 18(1), 51-75.</p> <p>Sherman, Lawrence W., Gartin, Patrick R., & Buerger, Michael E. (1989). Hot spots of predatory crime: Routine activities and the criminology of place. <i>Criminology</i>, 27, 27-55.</p> <p>Telep, Cody W., Weisburd, David, Gill, Charlotte E., Vitter, Zoe, & Teichman, Doron (2014). Displacement of crime and diffusion of crime control benefits in large-scale geographic areas: A systematic review. <i>Journal of Experimental Criminology</i>, 10(4), 515-548.</p> <p>Weisburd, David, Hinkle, Joshua C., Famega, Christine, & Ready, Justin (2011). The possible “backfire” effects of hot spots policing: An experimental assessment of impacts on legitimacy, fear and collective efficacy. <i>Journal of Experimental Criminology</i>, 7(4), 297-320.</p> <p>Weisburd, David, Wooditch, Alese, Weisburd, Sarit, & Yang, Sue-Ming. (2016). Do stop, question, and frisk practices deter crime? Evidence at microunits of space and time. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 15, 31-56.</p> <p>Wellford, Charles F., Cynthia Lum, Thomas Scott, Heather Vovak, and J. Amber Scherer. (2019). Clearing homicides: Role of organizational, case, and investigative dimensions. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i> 18(3), 553-600.</p>
<p>February 26</p>	<p>Courts, Prosecution, and Sentencing</p> <p>Readings:</p> <p>Frase, Richard S. (2019). Forty years of American sentencing guidelines: What have we learned. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 48, 79-135.</p> <p>Gest, Ted. (2018). The courts in a fragmented criminal justice system. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 17(2), 309-320.</p> <p>Kaiser, Kimberly. (2019). An evaluation of successful program completions across types of problem-solving courts. <i>Justice Evaluation Journal</i>, https://doi.org/10.1080/24751979.2019.1679009.</p> <p>Piquero, Alex R., & Jennings, Wesley G. (2017). Research note: Justice system-imposed financial penalties increase the likelihood of recidivism in a sample of adolescent offenders. <i>Youth Violence & Juvenile Justice</i>, 15, 325-340.</p> <p>Sample, Lisa L., & Bray, Timothy M. (2003). Are sex offenders dangerous? <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, 3(1), 59-82.</p> <p>Shaffer, Deborah Koetzle. (2011). Looking inside the black box of drug courts: A met-analytic review. <i>Justice Quarterly</i>, 28(3), 493-521.</p> <p>Sherman, Lawrence W., Strang, Heather, Barnes, Geoffrey, Woods, Daniel J., Bennett, Sarah, Inkpen, Nova, Newbury-Birch, Dorothy, Rossner, Meredith, Angel, Caroline, et al. (2015). Twelve experiments in restorative justice: The Jerry Lee Program of randomized trials of restorative justice conferences. <i>Journal of Experimental Criminology</i>, 11, 501-540.</p> <p>Spohn, Cassia. (2018). Reflections on the exercise of prosecutorial discretion 50 years after publication of <i>The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society</i>. <i>Criminology</i></p>

	<p>& <i>Public Policy</i>, 17(2), 321-340.</p> <p>Wright, Richard G. (2003). Sex offender registration and notification: Public attention, political emphasis and fear. <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, 3(1), 97-104.</p> <p>Wright, Ronald F. (2017). Reinventing American prosecution systems. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 46, 395-439.</p>
March 4	<p>Corrections (Incarceration)</p> <p>Readings:</p> <p>Bartos, Bradlye J. and Charis E. Kubrin. (2018). Can we downsize our prisons and jails without compromising public safety? Findings from California's Proposition 47. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 17(3), 693-715.</p> <p>Blumstein, Alfred. (2011). Approaches to reducing both imprisonment and crime. <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, 10(1), 93-102.</p> <p>Blumstein, Alfred, & Alex R. Piquero. (2007). Restore rationality to sentencing policy. <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, 6(4), 679-687.</p> <p>Durlauf, Steven N., & Daniel S. Nagin. (2011). Imprisonment and crime: Can both be reduced? <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, 10(1), 13-54.</p> <p>Gaes, Gerald G. (2019). Current status of prison privatization research on American prisons and jails. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 18, 269-93.</p> <p>Haney, Craig. (2018). The psychological effects of solitary confinement: A systematic critique. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 47, 365-416.</p> <p>MacKenzie, Doris Layton and Pamela K. Lattimore. (2018). To rehabilitate or not to rehabilitate: That is the question for corrections! <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 17(2), 355-377.</p> <p>Mulvey, Edward P. and Carol A. Schubert. (2017). Mentally ill individuals in jails and prisons. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 46, 231-77.</p> <p>Rhodes, William, Gerald G. Gaes, Ryan Kling, and Christopher Cutler. (2018). Relationship between prison length of stay and recidivism: A study using regression discontinuity and instrumental variables with multiple break points. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 17(3), 731-69.</p> <p>Tonry, Michael. (2019). Fifty years of American sentencing reform: Nine lessons. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 48, 1-34.</p>
March 11	<p>- Corrections (Re-entry and Alternatives to Incarceration)</p> <p>Readings:</p> <p>Boman, John H., IV and Thomas J. Mowen. (2017). Building the ties that bind, breaking the ties that don't: Family support, criminal peers, and reentry success. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 16(3), 753-774.</p>

	<p>Cowell, Alexander J., Alan Barnosky, Pamela K. Lattimore, Joel K. Cartwright, and Matthew DeMichele. (2018). Economic evaluation of the HOPE demonstration field experiment. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 17(4), 875-899.</p> <p>Cullen, Francis T., Cheryl Lero Jonson, and Daniel P. Mears. (2017). Reinventing community corrections. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 46, 27-93.</p> <p>Jonson, Cheryl L., & Cullen, Francis T. (2015). Prisoner reentry programs. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 44, 517-75.</p> <p>Latessa, Edward (2012). Why work is important and how to improve the effectiveness of correctional reentry programs that target employment. <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, 11(1), 87-91.</p> <p>Rhine, Edward E., Joan Petersilia, and Kevin R. Reitz. (2017). The future of parole release. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 46, 279-338.</p> <p>Ruback, R. Barry, Lauren K. Knoth, Andrew S. Gladfelter, and Brendan Lantz. (2018). Restitution payment and recidivism: An experimental analysis. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 17(4), 789-813.</p> <p>Schriro, Dora (2012). Good science, good sense: Making meaningful change happen – a practitioner’s perspective. <i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>, 11(1), 101-110.</p> <p>Wolff, Kevin T., Laura M. Baber, Christine A. Dozier, and Roberto Cordeiro. (2019). Assessing the efficacy of alternatives to incarceration within seven federal districts. <i>Justice Evaluation Journal</i>, https://doi.org/10.1080/24751979.2019.1654354.</p>
March 18	No Class, Spring Break
March 25	No Class, UTD Cancellation
April 1	<p>Evaluating Gun Policy (via Blackboard Collaborate) Approve Class Presentation Articles</p> <p>Readings:</p> <p>Bartos, Bradley J., Richard McCleary, Lorraine Mazerolle, and Kelsy Luengen. (2020). Controlling gun violence: Assessing the impact of Australia’s gun buyback program using a synthetic control group experiment. <i>Prevention Science</i>, 21, 131-36.</p> <p>Cook, Philip J. (2018). Challenge of firearms control in a free society. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 17(2), 437-451.</p> <p>Hemenway, David. (2017). Reducing firearm violence. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 46, 201-230.</p> <p>Koper, Christopher S. (2020). Assessing the potential to reduce deaths and injuries from mass shootings through restrictions on assault weapons and other high-capacity semiautomatic firearms. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, DOI: 10.1111/1745-9133.12485</p> <p>Langman, Peter. (2019). Desperate identities: A bio-psycho-social analysis of</p>

	<p>perpetrators of mass violence. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, DOI: 10.1111/1745-9133.12468</p> <p>Lankford, Adam & James Silver. (2019). Why have public mass shootings become more deadly? Assessing how perpetrators' motives and methods have changed over time. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, DOI: 10.1111/1745-9133.12472</p> <p>Laqueur, Hannah S. & Garen J. Wintemute. (2019). Identifying high-risk firearm owners to prevent mass violence. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, DOI: 10.1111/1745-9133.12477</p> <p>Lawrence, Daniel S., Nancy G. LaVigne, Margaret Goff, and Paige S. Thompson. (2018). Lessons learned implementing gunshot detection technology: Results of a process evaluation in three major cities. <i>Justice Evaluation Journal</i>, 1(2), 109-29.</p> <p>Nagin, Daniel S., Christopher S. Koper, and Cynthia Lum. (2020). Policy recommendations for countering mass shootings in the United States. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, DOI: 10.1111/1745-9133.12484</p>
April 8	Exam 2
April 15	<p>Evaluating Drug Policy (via Blackboard Collaborate)</p> <p>Readings:</p> <p>Connealy, Nathan, Eriz Piza, and Dave Hatten. (2019). The criminogenic effect of marijuana dispensaries in Denver, Colorado: A microsynthetic control quasi-experiment and cost-benefit analysis. <i>Justice Evaluation Journal</i>, https://doi.org/10.1080/24751979.2019.1691934</p> <p>Lu, Ruibin, Dale Willits, Mary K. Stohr, et al. (2019). The cannabis effect on crime: Time-series analysis of crime in Colorado and Washington State. <i>Justice Quarterly</i>, https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2019.1666903</p> <p>Mitchell, Ojmarh, Cochran, Joshua C., Mears, Daniel P., & Bales, William D. (2017). The effectiveness of prison for reducing drug offender recidivism: a regression discontinuity analysis. <i>Journal of Experimental Criminology</i>, 13, 1-27.</p> <p>Pardo, Bryce and Peter Reuter. (2018). Narcotics and Drug Abuse: Foreshadowing of 50 years of change. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 17(2), 419-436.</p> <p>Pollack, Harold A. (2017). Dealing more effectively with problematic substance use and crime. <i>Crime and Justice</i>, 46, 159-200.</p> <p>Saunders, Jessica, Michael Robbins, and Allison J. Ober. (2017). Moving from efficacy to effectiveness: Implementing the drug market intervention across multiple sites. <i>Criminology & Public Policy</i>, 16(3), 787-814.</p>
April 22	Class Presentations (via Blackboard Collaborate)
April 29	Class Presentations (via Blackboard Collaborate)

Assignments

Exams	Each exam will require that you fully evaluate and explain your rankings for a CrimeSolutions.gov program. You will work from and submit a completed CrimeSolutions.gov scoring instrument. Details for how to complete the scoring instrument will be provided during the January 22 class session and at other times as deemed necessary. Exams are take-home.
Class Presentations	<p>Presentations will require each student to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Locate a crime prevention evaluation article*, 2. Have the selected article approved by the instructor by April 8. Get started sooner than later on this! The longer you wait, the more likely it is another student will have selected your article of choice. 3. Prepare a one to two page summary of the article which includes a critical analysis of its findings (due at the time of the presentation), 4. Summarize the article orally in class (15 minutes, give or take), and 5. Lead a discussion (aided by at least three discussion questions) on the subject matter involved in the article. <p>You will be expected to provide each class member (and me) with a copy of the article and your summary in advance of the session you present in.**</p> <p>* The article selected must NOT be one from the assigned reading list and CANNOT duplicate another student's article. The literature source selected must be a published journal article, book chapter or other source that is an original statement or presentation (i.e., not a summary, textbook, or other secondary source).</p> <p>** Time slots for the presentations are first come, first served.</p>

Course Policies

Grading (credit) Criteria	<p>Grades will be calculated as follows:</p> <p>Participation = 100 points Exam 1 = 100 points Exam 2 = 100 points Oral Presentation = 100 points</p> <p>Total points = 400</p> <p>Scale</p> <p>98-100 = A+ 93-97 = A 90-92 = A- 88-89 = B+ 83-87 = B 80-82 = B- 78-79 = C+ 73-77 = C 70-72 = C- 68-69 = D+ 63-67 = D 60-62 = D-</p>
----------------------------------	---

	59 and below = F GRADES ARE NOT “FLEXIBLE.” Requests for charity-case grade inflation will be ignored and/or declined. Also, remember, in graduate school a B- is REALLY bad.
Make-up Exams	N/A
Extra Credit	N/A
Late Work	Late work will receive NO credit (but the make-up exam policy applies).
Special Assignments	N/A
Participation	You are required to attend AND participate in class. Every student should plan on speaking at least once during each class session.
Classroom Citizenship	You are expected to (1) be on time; (2) refrain from talking to one another in class; (3) turn off your cell phone; (4) be mature and responsible; (5) show respect for your peers and the professor; and (6) otherwise act in a manner consistent with UTD’s student conduct policy.

Other Pertinent UTD Rules and Regulations

See: <https://coursebook.utdallas.edu/syllabus-policies>