

Table of Contents

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Jacques, Scott - #3584 - 478..... | 1 |
| Letter of Support..... | 12 |
| Proposal Narrative..... | 13 |

Application Summary

Competition Details

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Competition Title: | Textbook Transformation Grants, Round Fifteen (Fall 2019 - Fall 2020) |
| Category: | University System of Georgia |
| Award Cycle: | Round 15 |
| Submission Deadline: | 09/16/2019 at 11:59 PM |

Application Information

| | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Submitted By: | Scott Jacques |
| Application ID: | 3584 |
| Application Title: | 478 |
| Date Submitted: | 09/17/2019 at 8:28 AM |

Personal Details

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Institution Name(s): | Georgia State University |
| Applicant First Name: | Scott |
| Applicant Last Name: | Jacques |
| Applicant Email Address: | sjacques1@gsu.edu |
| Applicant Phone Number: | 7062968707 |
| Primary Appointment Title: | Associate Professor of Criminal Justice and Criminology |
| Submitter First Name: | Scott |
| Submitter Last Name: | Jacques |
| Submitter Email Address: | sjacques1@gsu.edu |
| Submitter Phone Number: | 7062968707 |
| Submitter Title: | Associate Professor of Criminal Justice and Criminology |

Application Details

Proposal Title

478

Requested Amount of Funding

\$30,000

Priority Category (if applicable)

None / N/A

Final Semester:

Fall 2020

Course Title(s)

Policing in America; Social Science & the American Crime Problem; Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice; Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice

Course Number(s)

CRJU 2110, 2200, 3060, 3610

Team Member 1 Name

Scott Jacques

Team Member 1 Email

sjacques1@gsu.edu

Team Member 2 Name

Dean Dabney

Team Member 2 Email

ddabney@gsu.edu

Team Member 3 Name

Leah Daigle

Team Member 3 Email

ldaigle@gsu.edu

Team Member 4 Name

Josh Hinkle

Team Member 4 Email

jhinkle@gsu.edu

Additional Team Members (Name and email address for each)

Marie Ouellet, mouellet@gsu.edu

Michael Shapiro, mshapiro5@gsu.edu

Sponsor Name

Dean Dabney

Sponsor Title

Chair

Sponsor Department

Criminal Justice and Criminology

Average Number of Students per Course Section Affected by Project in One Academic Year

69

Average Number of Sections Affected by Project in One Academic Year

Total Number of Students Affected by Project in One Academic Year

1655

Average Number of Students Affected per Summer Semester

215

Average Number of Students Affected per Fall Semester

720

Average Number of Students Affected per Spring Semester

720

Original Required Commercial Materials (title, author, price, and bookstore or retailer URL showing price)

Police in America, by Samuel Walker and Charles M. Katz, at \$247.75. Click ['here'](#) to see at GSU bookstore. (Used in CRJU 2110, which has 120 students in fall, 120 in spring, 40 in summer. Total is \$69,370.)

Crime & The American Dream, by Steven F. Messner and Richard Rosenfeld, at \$156.25; and, The Politics of Injustice, by Katherine Beckett & Theodore Sasson, at \$77. Click ['here'](#) and ['here.'](#) respectively, to see at GSU bookstore. (Used in Dr. Dabney's section of CRJU 2200, which has 120 students in fall, 120 in spring, and 0 in summer. Total is \$55,980.)

Six criminology books (Maximum Security Book Club; Newjack; Cop in the Hood; On the Run; Sidewalk; Is Killing Wrong?), each with a different author, totaling \$114.89. Click ['here'](#) to see at the GSU bookstore. (Used in Dr. Jacques' section of CRJU 2200 and that delivered by his graduate assistant, which have 260 students in fall, 260 in spring, and 100 in summer. Total is \$71,231.80.)

Police Ethics, 2nd edition, by Douglas Perez and Alan J. Moore, at \$239.99. Click ['here'](#) to see at GSU bookstore. (Used in CRJU 3060, which has 115 students in fall, 115 in spring, and 35 in summer. Total is \$63,597.35.)

Statistics for Criminology & Criminal Justice, 2nd edition, by Jacinta M. Gau, at \$108. Click ['here'](#) to see at GSU bookstore. (Used in CRJU 3610, which has 105 students in fall, 105 in spring, and 40 in summer. Total is \$27,000.)

Original Total Cost per Student

\$173.52

Post-Project Cost per Student

\$0

Post-Project Savings per Student

\$173.52

Projected Total Annual Student Savings per Academic Year

\$287,179.15

Using OpenStax Textbook?

No

Project Goals

Our proposal is to transform four courses to no-cost. Each course is required for students majoring in criminal justice and criminology: Policing in America; Social Science & the American Crime Problem; Ethical Issues; and, Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice. This project has four major goals.

Goal 1 is to eliminate the cost of textbooks for students and thereby reduce their financial burden. Currently, the above courses require students to spend a considerable sum on textbooks. For each course, the pre-tax textbook cost exceeds \$100. There is a significant need for no-cost options at our institution, Georgia State University. This is evidenced by 59% of GSU students receiving Pell Grants, which is indicative of a low-income background (<https://success.gsu.edu/initiatives/panther-retention-grants/>). The transformation will bring the cost of textbooks to zero, saving our students hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

Goal 2 is to increase students' timely access to course materials and thereby improve student success. Due to the cost of textbooks, many students forgo expediently, if ever, purchasing the reading material. This impedes their ability to complete assignments, score well on quizzes/tests, succeed in the course, and, more generally, succeed in higher education (which, of course, affects their post-education life). These student outcomes add up, resulting in higher drop/withdraw/fail (DWF) rates, lower GPAs, lower retention rates, and longer time to graduation. Thus, by bringing the cost of textbooks to zero, the transformation will improve student outcomes.

Also tied to that goal, a benefit of the transformation reflects that no-cost textbooks tend to be digital. These can be viewed instantaneously, unlike physical textbooks which must be picked up at a store or delivered by mail. Every semester, students notify us that they cannot immediately obtain the textbook because of online sellers' shipping times or the bookstore selling out of (the more affordable) used copies. These delays in obtaining textbooks get students off to a bad start, leading to the same negative student success outcomes described above. Thus, by transforming our courses to no-cost digital textbooks, the transformation will improve student outcomes.

Goal 3 is to increase students' accessibility to the courses, and thereby improve student outcomes, by making each course available in seated and online formats. At present, only one of the four targeted courses, CRJU 2200, is taught in both seated and online formats. As with physical versus digital textbooks, there are disadvantages to courses being seated (i.e., physical) instead of online (i.e., digital). For students with conflicting commitments, such as parenting or work obligations, it can be difficult to attend seated classes. Also, for students who live off campus, especially if outside Atlanta, the commute to GSU's Downtown campus takes considerable time and resources (e.g., money for gas and parking). These factors deter students from attending class, which harms the student outcomes described above. A practical way to counter those problems is to offer courses in an online format. However, there also are advantages to seated over online courses. Therefore, we want to offer students the choice between them, which they can base on what works best for them. When transforming the courses to no-cost, we will do so in a way that accommodates teaching them seated and online, which will improve student outcomes.

Finally, Goal 4 is to push our department to a point at which the pedagogical norm transforms from costly to no-cost textbooks; this will strengthen our ability to achieve goals one and two. The details behind the fourth goal are presented in the next section.

Statement of Transformation

The proposed transformation will contribute to our department's initiative to make across-the-curriculum cuts to textbook costs. As explained below, the proposed transformation will culminate in all of our required courses being solely taught with no-cost learning materials. This is our first big step toward the ultimate goal of creating a "Z-Degree"; that is, one with zero textbook costs for our courses (see [Bliss, 2015](#)). This is in line with Jeff Gallant's vision for ALG: "In the future, I see our community of practice within ALG growing more connected and more visible, pursuing not only more OER adoptions, adaptations, and creations, but also entire degree programs with zero textbook costs, similar to the Z-Degree and Zed Cred programs pioneering this effort elsewhere" ([Panke, 2018](#)).

Before describing those efforts, it is useful to describe the past, present, and future of our courses. The department's history is one of each instructor having full discretion to design and deliver a course as he/she sees fit, with little constraining their efforts than the official course description and projected student cap. Thus, and with some exceptions (e.g., statistics and internship courses), instructors of the same course made little effort to share or align their course content and assessment tools. This approach is not necessarily bad, as it increases the diversity of within-course options for students.

Yet, that approach has limitations. It reduces each course's "internal reliability," lowering the certainty of what any given student is learning and what any given letter grade reflects. That issue is becoming a bigger one in recent years, due to the department's growing use of PhD students as instructors. They benefit from the experience (and, thus, become more attractive job applicants) and it helps the department afford their stipends. That said, it is not ideal to "throw" PhD students to the podium and tell them to create a course from scratch. After all, compared to faculty, PhD students lack the teaching or substantive expertise, not to mention the time, needed to develop and design high quality courses.

To address the above problems, the department began, this semester, a new collaborative process aimed at reducing the burden on PhD student instructors; increasing the internal reliability of our courses; facilitating their continuous improvement in an efficient manner; and, as described below, familiarizing them in the "why and how" of no-cost learning material. The process involves the following: Faculty share their courses "in toto" with PhD student instructors, who deliver them while improving them for the future (e.g., come up with new assignments), and share the improvements with other instructors. Furthermore, faculty share materials with each other and work together on future course development and design.

That new collaborative process presents an opportunity to establish no-cost courses as the cornerstone of our department curriculum and teaching philosophy. As described below, the plan is to transform (all sections of) all required courses, and then move to transforming the electives. This proposal focuses on the required courses, though please note that we have concrete plans for transforming the electives to no-cost (and for which we do not intend to request ALG support).

To transform required courses, the plan has two initiatives. The first fixes another problem with the autonomous approach to course development and design: Our department has been awarded and completed ALG grants to transform three required courses (Introduction to Criminal Justice; Research Methods in Criminal Justice; Criminological Theory), but their no-cost learning materials have not been adopted across all sections of those courses. The department has one ALG project currently underway, namely that to transform American Criminal Courts to no-cost. Furthermore, Corrections as well as Internship & Field Placement already have no-cost versions (not supported by ALG). As part of the new collaborative process, therefore, the no-cost versions of these courses will be shared with PhD students for them to deliver and improve. By doing so, the department will increase the positive effect of the prior ALG grants and ensure it continues.

Before describing the second initiative (see next paragraph), note that the above initiative includes, to use ALG's phrasing, "Scaling Up OER Projects." As stated in the RFP: "Projects in the Scaling Up OER category are intended for moving a standard-scale Textbook Transformation Grant team's previously-completed project to a department-wide, all-sections scale. Funding for this category is identical to large-scale transformation grants." (To be clear, we are not requesting ALG funding for our scaling up per se, nor will we do so in a subsequent proposal, but have described it herein because of how it relates to the Statement of Transformation.)

The second initiative directly involves the current proposal. As mentioned above, our department has ten required courses, of which six have no-cost versions. We are requesting ALG support our efforts to transform the other four: Policing in America; Social Science & the American Crime Problem; Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice; and Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice. Once completed, all future sections of all ten required courses will be no-cost. The plan to put this initiative into action is presented in the next section.

Transformation Action Plan

Our project team consists of subject matter experts in the four targeted courses. Each of us will work on transforming a course in which we have considerable experience developing, designing, and delivering. Josh Hinkle and Michael Shapiro are in charge of, respectively, transforming Policing in America and Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice. Dean Dabney and Scott Jacques will transform Social Science & the American Crime Problem, which is part of GSU's Core Curriculum (Area E3). Two of us will work on that course because it has, by far, the largest enrollment of any course in our curriculum, and expected to grow; larger enrollment increases the opportunity to cheat, in that there are more people with whom to share answers; and, thus, Dean Dabney and Scott Jacques will create a far greater amount of assessment questions and other tools than usual, allowing us to vary them within and between course sections, which will help prevent cheating. Leah Daigle and Marie Ouellet will transform Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice. Two of us will work on that course for two reasons: One, and as true of many social science curriculums, "stats" is the most difficult course as measured by DWF rates, so especially great care is needed to ensure student success. Two, it is possible that said difficulty is exacerbated by insufficient alignment with another course, Research Methods in Criminal Justice, so the transformation will also involve increasing their alignment.

Furthermore, and tying into our transformation activities, Scott Jacques has expertise in open educational resources (OER). This expertise stems from his involvement in three prior ALG grants, and also due to his work as Director of AYS Open. "AYS" is short for the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, which is our department's college. AYS Open is the college's initiative to provide and use more free information, such as OER. From working in this capacity, Scott Jacques has considerable knowledge of how to find, use, make, and evaluate OER. Thus, his role in the proposed transformation also includes guiding the other team members in adopting OER (or materials free via our library). Additionally, we will draw on others at GSU as needed (e.g., to confirm accessibility by students with disabilities). We have many personnel resources at our disposal, including our subject librarian, La Loria Konata; GSU's ALG Champion, Denise Dimsdale; and, experts in GSU's Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

For this transformation, we will replace our current for-purchase textbooks with texts that are free to us and our students (among others). There are three key steps, described below.

Step 1 is to identify and review textbooks for the four courses. To do so, we will search amazon.com and chegg.com, which are major providers of university textbooks. For the first ten books listed on each site for each course (excluding those "sponsored" on amazon.com), we will analyze their respective table of contents to identify their 1) major topics, 2) subtopics, and 3) ordering of those. The findings will be used to decide what topics and subtopics to cover in the courses, and in what order.

Step 2 is curating one or more texts for each topic (including its subtopics). The texts may be articles, chapters, books, or another type of publication (e.g., legal cases, government reports). To select between texts, we will take into account ALG's evaluation criteria: clarity, comprehensibility, readability, content accuracy and technical accuracy, adaptability, appropriateness, and accessibility. For step 2, we will only consider texts that are open access (i.e., free to everyone), in the public domain (and thus also free to everyone), or available as unlimited e-versions via the GSU library (e.g., articles available via Galileo). Based on our preliminary evaluation (see next paragraph) of currently available no-cost texts, we do not think it will be necessary to take advantage of the "fair use" doctrine. However, should that change, USG's Fair Use Checklist will guide our use of texts that are crucial but otherwise unavailable for free to students. Should there be any uncertainty about the fair use of a particular reading, we will consult copyright experts (e.g., GSU's Gwen Spratt) about how to proceed.

As part of step 2, we will extensively evaluate potential no-cost texts to adopt in the targeted courses. To prepare this ALG proposal, we made a preliminary evaluation. The results make us fully confident that we can successfully transform the courses to no-cost and achieve our goals. The following ideas are based on the preliminary evaluation, and, though tentative, demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed transformation. For Policing in America, there is no textbook that is open access or in the public domain that we deem of sufficient quality to adopt. Instead, this course will likely lean on library-based texts. In the near future, our library will purchase an unlimited e-version of a new book, The Cambridge Handbook of Policing in the United States, that will be used in the course. Readings therein will be supplemented with articles from peer-reviewed journals available via the library. For Social Science & the American Crime Problem, we will replace the current books with those that are open access (e.g., Protect Serve, and Deport; Good Guys with Guns) or available via the library in unlimited e-versions (Hurt: Chronicles of the Drug War; Hard Time). They will be supplemented with articles available via the library. For Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice, the idea is to adopt an open access textbook, Ethics in Law Enforcement (BCCampus), and supplement it with articles available via the library as well as legal cases on the website of the Caselaw Access Project (Harvard Law School). For Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice, we considered OpenStax's Introductory Statistics, but it covers too many statistical techniques that are largely irrelevant to criminal justice research, and presents information in ways that are suboptimal for our student body. Instead, then, the course will become more dependent on lecture-based content. On GSU's Learning Management System, known as iCollege (i.e., Brightspace, D2L), the instructors will provide pre-recorded lectures and accompanying materials (e.g., PowerPoints). Those materials will be accessible at all times by students, in both seated and online sections, making it possible for them to repeatedly review the material. They will be supplemented with a mixture of open access and library-provided articles or book chapters devoted to specific course (sub)topics.

Step 3. On iCollege, students will be guided to the curated texts. For a work that is open access or in the public domain, students will be directed to an external link that hosts the text. For works only available for free via the GSU library, students will be directed to an internal link that can be used to access the text. Should we resort to the fair use doctrine, the work will be uploaded in iCollege, with a clear warning to students that the work is copyrighted and not to be redistributed. As part of step 3, we will consult with CETL to optimize the organization and presentation of texts on iCollege. Among other considerations, this entails deciding how best to integrate and connect each text with other course activities.

With those steps complete, we will make our no-cost text selections publicly available in the form of LibGuides posted on GSU's website. A LibGuide is a set of webpages that directs users to resources on a particular topic or course subject. LibGuides are typically prepared by librarians and appear as university library webpages. At present, we do not intend to create course materials suitable for sharing on GALILEO Open Learning Materials, perhaps with the exception of Statistics in Criminal Justice. Should we create such materials, they will be shared on that website.

Quantitative & Qualitative Measures

The transformations' success will be assessed by obtaining and analyzing data bearing on (1) student satisfaction, (2) student performance, and (3) course-level retention. The same data will be collected on the pre-transformed (spring semester 2020) and transformed version of each course (fall semester 2020). An advantage of this team's prior involvement in ALG grants is that the following approaches are informed by those experiences, which included collaboration with GSU's Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL). Should any new unique needs arise in relation to the proposed transformation, we will work together and with CETL to develop extra tools to address those needs.

(1) Student satisfaction will be ascertained with two surveys. Both surveys include quantitative and qualitative components. The first student satisfaction survey is that administered by GSU to evaluate all course sections, every semester. In addition to facilitating within-course comparisons (pre-transformed versus transformed), this survey will allow us to make between-course comparisons. This is because for each course section, GSU automatically compares its averages to other sections of the same course (if more than one), all department course sections, and all college course sections. The survey generates quantitative data by asking students to evaluate each of the following from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree):

- The instructor followed the plan for the course as established in the syllabus.
- The instructor gave assignments relevant to the goals of this course.
- The instructor explained the course grading system clearly.
- The instructor was willing and able to answer students' questions.
- The instructor was receptive to students' and others' opinions. Test questions clearly related to course content.
- The instructor communicates effectively.
- The instructor was well prepared.
- The instructor demonstrated extensive knowledge of the subject.
- The instructor stimulated me to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses.
- The instructor's teaching methods aid students in understanding the material.
- The instructor provided helpful feedback on assignments. The instructor was accessible to students outside of class.
- The overall structuring and sequencing of topics in this course facilitated learning.
- Course assignments, including examinations, required creative and original thinking beyond mere memorization of material.
- I am pleased with how much I learned in the course.
- Considering the subject matter of the course, the instructor was effective as a teacher.

Also, students are asked to evaluate from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Superior):

- Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?
- What is your overall rating of this course?

Before presenting open-ended questions that prompt qualitative data, students are asked to choose a response category for the following:

- Generally, how many hours per week did you spend outside of class preparing for class? (0-2; 3-4; 4-8; 9-14)
- What is your grade point average at GSU? (4.3-4.00; 3.99-3.75; 3.74-3.00; 2.99-2.50; 2.50-0.00; New GSU Student (No GPA))
- For undergraduates only, which best applies to you? (freshman; sophomore; junior; senior; other)

Finally, qualitative data are produced by asking students to describe "Course strengths"; "Course weaknesses"; "Instructor strengths"; "Instructor weaknesses"; "Suggestions for course improvement"; "Suggestions for instructor improvement"; and, "Comments on classroom environment."

The second student satisfaction survey is specific to textbooks. In collaboration with CETL, this survey was crafted to reflect the GSU-wide survey (see above) and garner further insight into textbooks. Within each course section, it will

be delivered via iCollege during the last week of the course. First, the survey will generate quantitative data by asking students to evaluate each of the following from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree):

- Generally, I think textbooks are too expensive.
- Generally, I think the cost of textbooks is more than I can afford.
- Generally, I think students would do better in college if textbooks were less expensive.

For the pre-transformed courses, students are asked to evaluate the following with the same scale:

- For this class, I think buying the textbook(s) led me to learn more.

For the transformed courses, students are asked to evaluate the following with the same scale:

- For this class, I think I would have learned more if I had to purchase a textbook.

Because students may choose to buy a physical version of free digital textbooks, the following question applies to, and thus will be asked of, students in the pre-transformed and transformed courses:

- For this class, how much did you spend on the textbook(s)?
- For this class, how did you obtain the textbook(s)? For this class, how did you obtain the textbook(s)? (I didn't obtain it; Bought/rented from bookstore; Bought/rented from online seller; Bought/rented from individual you know; Borrowed from individual you know; Borrowed physical version from library; Free e-version via library website; Free e-version via non-library website; Other, describe.)

Finally, qualitative data will be produced by asking students to describe "Textbook strengths"; "Textbook weaknesses"; "Suggestions for textbook improvement."

(2) Student performance will be determined in two ways. One is through student grades, including not only final grades but also those on specific topics (e.g., modules devoted to policing versus corrections), based on various assessment tools (e.g., quizzes versus discussion posts), at different points in the semester. This information will be available via iCollege, as instructors will solely use it to record grades.

The second way we will assess student performance is through a test that will not count toward student grades, but will measure their learning and, unlike the above grades, be developed and delivered in the same way across all four courses involved in the transformation. First, for each course, its learning objectives will be mapped to multiple-choice questions. These questions will reflect the essential knowledge that students should "walk away with" from taking a course. Then at the beginning, midpoint, and conclusion of each course, students will be given the test via iCollege. The results will allow us to measure progressive learning throughout the courses, and compare this progression across pre-transformed and transformed versions. Note that to counter testing effects, the questions found on any given test (e.g., that of Jane Doe at midpoint) will be drawn at random from a large question bank.

(3) Course-level retention will be determined with IPORT, which is GSU's "web-based application that provides access to data stored in the University Data Warehouse" (<https://oie.gsu.edu/decision-support-services-dss/iport/>). For each GSU course section, IPORT has a daily record of how many students dropped it (or added it); the number of students who failed; and, the number of students who withdrew. These are just a few of the variables available via IPORT. We will use others, as appropriate, to better understand the range of factors that shape the effect of textbook costs on DWF rates, in addition to measures of student performance (e.g., mean, median, and mode of final grades).

Timeline

The timeline, immediately below, outlines dates at which course redevelopment actions will be completed.

- October 4, 2019: Notification of award.
- October 28, 2019: Kickoff Meeting attended by two or more team members.
- November-December 2019: For each course, compile textbooks and conduct a content analysis of their chapter and section contents, focusing on topic coverage and order in which topics are covered. Also, map learning objectives to multiple-choice questions that reflect the essential knowledge that students should “walk away with” from taking a course.
- January-May 2020: Based on findings of content analysis for each course, decide which topics to cover and in what order; identify, review, and select new reading materials; curate and develop non-reading materials; upload materials to iCollege. Consult with CETL to optimize organization/presentation of materials on iCollege; consider incorporation of other non-reading materials; and develop/integrate them as appropriate.
- June-July 2020: Finalize course syllabus and all materials; begin preparing LibGuides.
- August 2020: Begin delivering transformed courses; publish LibGuides.
- December 2020 and after: Based on findings (see assessment timeline, below), refine courses for future semesters.

The following timeline outlines dates at which course assessment actions will be completed. (For further details, refer back to section on Qualitative and Quantitative Measures.)

- December 2019: Upload tests on the knowledge to “walk away with” for each course; put everything in place that will be needed for data entry (e.g., data labels in statistical software program).
- January 2020: At semester start, administer “walk away with” tests; enter results into dataset.
- March 2020: At semester midpoint, administer “walk away with” tests; enter results into dataset.
- May 2020: At semester end, administer “walk away with” tests; provide students with student satisfaction survey that is specific to learning materials; enter those results, those from GSU-wide student satisfaction survey, and information on IPORT into dataset.
- August 2020: At semester start, administer “walk away with” tests; enter results into dataset.
- October 2020: At semester midpoint, administer “walk away with” tests; enter results into dataset.
- December 2020: At semester end, administer “walk away with” tests; provide students with student satisfaction survey that is specific to learning materials; enter those results, those from GSU-wide student satisfaction survey, and information on IPORT into dataset; analyze data; write and submit final report.

Budget

The requested budget is \$30,000. This total breaks down as follows:

Travel and overall project expenses, \$800.

Contract Overload, \$29,200.

1. Scott Jacques, \$4,866.66.
2. Dean Dabney, \$4,866.66.
3. Leah Daigle, \$4,866.66.
4. Josh Hinkle, \$4,866.66.
5. Marie Ouellet, \$4,866.66.
6. Michael Shapiro, \$4,866.70.

Sustainability Plan

As outlined in the Statement of Transformation section, the proposed project will have a lasting impact on GSU students. When the project is complete, our department will have the distinction of using no-cost materials in (all sections of) the ten required courses for our major. This will establish our department as a model for others to emulate, all the more so as we move toward a Z-degree. In that vein, by sharing these courses with PhD student instructors, we equip them to spread the no-cost pedagogy to their future institutions. Furthermore, at the 2021 Annual Meeting of the American Criminal Justice Sciences (the major society/association of criminal justice academics), Scott Jacques will present the why, how, and effect of the department's transformation.

As part of the department's recent move to a collaborative teaching process, there is already a sustainability plan in place. It consists of a "blueprint" for each course that (1) shows when its no-cost version was, or will be, most recently created and delivered; (2) schedules, within two years, at least one faculty member and PhD student to update and otherwise improve the course; and, (3) schedules, within the next year, the updated version to be delivered. The process then repeats every three years. This sustainability plan ensures the maintenance and updating of our course materials.

Acknowledgment

Grant Acceptance

[Acknowledged] I understand and acknowledge that acceptance of Affordable Learning Georgia grant funding constitutes a commitment to comply with the required activities listed in the RFP and that my submitted proposal will serve as the statement of work that must be completed by my project team. I further understand and acknowledge that failure to complete the deliverables in the statement of work may result in termination of the agreement and funding.



September 4, 2019

Dear Selection Committee:

This letter certifies that the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology at Georgia State University supports the ALG proposal, "Transformation of Four Required Criminal Justice and Criminology Courses to No-Cost." Speaking not only as Chair, but also as a member of the proposal's team, I am excited by the prospect of offering the four courses at no-cost, thereby making all of our required courses no-cost. This will have a strong impact on our students, not only by saving them money but also by improving their success in the classroom and progression through our degree program. As described in the proposal, the department has a robust sustainability plan for the project that will ensure its impact multiplies from semester to semester.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dean Dabney".

Dean Dabney
Chair and Professor
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies
Georgia State University

Applicant, Team, and Sponsor Information

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Institution(s) | Georgia State University |
| Applicant Name | Scott Jacques |
| Applicant Email | sjacques1@gsu.edu |
| Applicant Phone # | 706-296-8707 |
| Applicant Position/Title | Associate Professor of Criminal Justice and Criminology |
| Submitter Name | Same as above |
| Submitter Email | |
| Submitter Phone # | |
| Submitter Position | |

| | Name | Email Address |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Team Member 1 | Scott Jacques | sjacques1@gsu.edu |
| Team Member 2 | Dean Dabney | ddabney@gsu.edu |
| Team Member 3 | Leah Daigle | ldaigle@gsu.edu |
| Team Member 4 | Josh Hinkle | jhinkle@gsu.edu |
| Team Member 5 | Marie Ouellet | mouellet@gsu.edu |
| Team Member 6 | Mike Shapiro | mshapiro5@gsu.edu |
| | | |

Please provide the sponsor's name, title, department, and institution. The sponsor is the provider of your Letter of Support.

| |
|--|
| Dean Dabney, Chair and Professor, Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology, Georgia State University |
|--|

Project Information and Impact Data

| | |
|--|--|
| Priority Category / Categories | None |
| Requested Amount of Funding | \$30,000 |
| Course Names and Course Numbers | Policing in America (CRJU 2110) Social Science & the American Crime Problem (CRJU 2200) Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice (CRJU 3060) Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice (CRJU 3610) |
| Final Semester of Project | Fall 2020 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Average Number of Students Per Course Section Affected by Project | 69 |
| Average Number of Sections Affected by Project in One Academic Year | 24 |
| Total Number of Students Affected by Project in One Academic Year | 1,655 |
| Average Number of Students Affected per Summer Semester | 215 |
| Average Number of Students Affected per Fall Semester | 720 |
| Average Number of Students Affected per Spring Semester | 720 |
| Original Required Commercial Materials | <p><i>Police in America</i>, by Samuel Walker and Charles M. Katz, at \$247.75. Click ‘here’ to see at GSU bookstore. (Used in CRJU 2110, which has 120 students in fall, 120 in spring, 40 in summer. Total is \$69,370.)</p> <p><i>Crime & The American Dream</i>, by Steven F. Messner and Richard Rosenfeld, at \$156.25; and, <i>The Politics of Injustice</i>, by Katherine Beckett & Theodore Sasson, at \$77. Click ‘here’ and ‘here.’ respectively, to see at GSU bookstore. (Used in Dr. Dabney’s section of CRJU 2200, which has 120 students in fall, 120 in spring, and 0 in summer. Total is \$55,980.)</p> <p>Six criminology books (<i>Maximum Security Book Club; Newjack; Cop in the Hood; On the Run; Sidewalk; Is Killing Wrong?</i>), each with a different author, totaling \$114.89. Click ‘here’ to see at the GSU bookstore. (Used in Dr. Jacques’ section of CRJU 2200 and that delivered by his graduate assistant, which have 260 students in fall, 260 in spring, and 100 in summer. Total is \$71,231.80.)</p> <p><i>Police Ethics</i>, 2nd edition, by Douglas Perez and Alan J. Moore, at \$239.99. Click ‘here’ to see at GSU bookstore. (Used in CRJU 3060, which has 115 students in fall, 115 in spring, and 35 in summer. Total is \$63,597.35.)</p> <p><i>Statistics for Criminology & Criminal Justice</i>, 2nd edition, by Jacinta M. Gau, at \$108. Click ‘here’ to see at GSU bookstore. (Used in CRJU 3610, which has 105 students in fall, 105 in spring, and 40 in summer. Total is \$27,000.)</p> <p>Note: Highest price reported. Prices current as of</p> |

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| | August 7, 2019. |
| Total Price of Original Required Materials Per Student | \$173.52 |
| Post-Project Cost Per Student | \$0 |
| Post-Project Savings Per Student | \$173.52 |
| Projected Total Annual Student Savings Per Academic Year | \$287,179.15 |
| Using OpenStax Textbook? | No. |

Narrative Section

1. Project Goals

Our proposal is to transform four courses to no-cost. Each course is required for students majoring in criminal justice and criminology: Policing in America; Social Science & the American Crime Problem; Ethical Issues; and, Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice. This project has four major goals.

Goal 1 is to eliminate the cost of textbooks for students and thereby reduce their financial burden. Currently, the above courses require students to spend a considerable sum on textbooks. For each course, the pre-tax textbook cost exceeds \$100. There is a significant need for no-cost options at our institution, Georgia State University. This is evidenced by 59% of GSU students receiving Pell Grants, which is indicative of a low-income background (<https://success.gsu.edu/initiatives/panther-retention-grants/>). The transformation will bring the cost of textbooks to zero, saving our students hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

Goal 2 is to increase students' timely access to course materials and thereby improve student success. Due to the cost of textbooks, many students forgo expediently, if ever, purchasing the reading material. This impedes their ability to complete assignments, score well on quizzes/tests, succeed in the course, and, more generally, succeed in higher education (which, of course, affects their post-education life). These student outcomes add up, resulting in higher drop/withdraw/fail (DWF) rates, lower GPAs, lower retention rates, and longer time to graduation. Thus, by bringing the cost of textbooks to zero, the transformation will improve student outcomes.

Also tied to that goal, a benefit of the transformation reflects that no-cost textbooks tend to be digital. These can be viewed instantaneously, unlike physical textbooks which must be picked up at a store or delivered by mail. Every semester, students notify us that they cannot immediately obtain the textbook because of online sellers' shipping times or the bookstore selling out of (the more affordable) used copies. These delays in obtaining textbooks get students off to a bad start, leading to the same negative student success outcomes described above. Thus, by transforming our courses to no-cost digital textbooks, the transformation will improve student outcomes.

Goal 3 is to increase students' accessibility to the courses, and thereby improve student outcomes, by making each course available in seated and online formats. At present, only one of the four targeted courses, CRJU 2200, is taught in both seated and online formats. As with physical versus digital textbooks, there are disadvantages to courses being seated (i.e., physical) instead of online (i.e., digital). For students with conflicting commitments, such as parenting or work obligations, it can be difficult to attend seated classes. Also, for students who live off campus, especially if outside Atlanta, the commute to GSU's Downtown campus takes considerable time and resources (e.g., money for gas and parking). These factors deter students

from attending class, which harms the student outcomes described above. A practical way to counter those problems is to offer courses in an online format. However, there also are advantages to seated over online courses. Therefore, we want to offer students the choice between them, which they can base on what works best for them. When transforming the courses to no-cost, we will do so in a way that accommodates teaching them seated and online, which will improve student outcomes.

Finally, Goal 4 is to push our department to a point at which the pedagogical norm transforms from costly to no-cost textbooks; this will strengthen our ability to achieve goals one and two. The details behind the fourth goal are presented in the next section.

2. Statement of Transformation

The proposed transformation will contribute to our department's initiative to make across-the-curriculum cuts to textbook costs. As explained below, the proposed transformation will culminate in all of our required courses being solely taught with no-cost learning materials. This is our first big step toward the ultimate goal of creating a "Z-Degree"; that is, one with zero textbook costs for our courses (see [Bliss, 2015](#)). This is in line with Jeff Gallant's vision for ALG: "In the future, I see our community of practice within ALG growing more connected and more visible, pursuing not only more OER adoptions, adaptations, and creations, but also entire degree programs with zero textbook costs, similar to the Z-Degree and Zed Cred programs pioneering this effort elsewhere" ([Panke, 2018](#)).

Before describing those efforts, it is useful to describe the past, present, and future of our courses. The department's history is one of each instructor having full discretion to design and deliver a course as he/she sees fit, with little constraining their efforts than the official course description and projected student cap. Thus, and with some exceptions (e.g., statistics and internship courses), instructors of the same course made little effort to share or align their course content and assessment tools. This approach is not necessarily bad, as it increases the diversity of within-course options for students.

Yet, that approach has limitations. It reduces each course's "internal reliability," lowering the certainty of what any given student is learning and what any given letter grade reflects. That issue is becoming a bigger one in recent years, due to the department's growing use of PhD students as instructors. They benefit from the experience (and, thus, become more attractive job applicants) and it helps the department afford their stipends. That said, it is not ideal to "throw" PhD students to the podium and tell them to create a course from scratch. After all, compared to faculty, PhD students lack the teaching or substantive expertise, not to mention the time, needed to develop and design high quality courses.

To address the above problems, the department began, this semester, a new collaborative process aimed at reducing the burden on PhD student instructors; increasing the internal reliability of our courses; facilitating their continuous improvement in an efficient manner; and, as described below, familiarizing them in the "why and how" of no-cost learning material. The process involves the following: Faculty share their courses "in toto" with PhD student instructors, who deliver them while improving them for the future (e.g., come up with new assignments), and share the improvements with other instructors. Furthermore, faculty share materials with each other and work together on future course development and design.

That new collaborative process presents an opportunity to establish no-cost courses as the cornerstone of our department curriculum and teaching philosophy. As described below, the plan is to transform (all sections of) all required courses, and then move to transforming the electives. This proposal focuses on the required courses, though please note that we have concrete plans for transforming the electives to no-cost (and for which we do not intend to request ALG support).

To transform required courses, the plan has two initiatives. The first fixes another problem with the autonomous approach to course development and design: Our department has been awarded and completed ALG grants to transform three required courses (Introduction to Criminal Justice; Research Methods in Criminal Justice; Criminological Theory), but their no-cost learning materials have not been adopted across all sections of those courses. The department has one ALG project currently underway, namely that to transform American Criminal Courts to no-cost. Furthermore, Corrections as well as Internship & Field Placement already have no-cost versions (not supported by ALG). As part of the new collaborative process, therefore, the no-cost versions of these courses will be shared with PhD students for them to deliver and improve. By doing so, the department will increase the positive effect of the prior ALG grants and ensure it continues.

Before describing the second initiative (see next paragraph), note that the above initiative includes, to use ALG's phrasing, "Scaling Up OER Projects." As stated in the RFP: "Projects in the Scaling Up OER category are intended for moving a standard-scale Textbook Transformation Grant team's previously-completed project to a department-wide, all-sections scale. Funding for this category is identical to large-scale transformation grants." (To be clear, we are not requesting ALG funding for our scaling up per se, nor will we do so in a subsequent proposal, but have described it herein because of how it relates to the Statement of Transformation.)

The second initiative directly involves the current proposal. As mentioned above, our department has ten required courses, of which six have no-cost versions. We are requesting ALG support our efforts to transform the other four: Policing in America; Social Science & the American Crime Problem; Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice; and Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice. Once completed, all future sections of all ten required courses will be no-cost. The plan to put this initiative into action is presented in the next section.

3. Transformation Action Plan

Our project team consists of subject matter experts in the four targeted courses. Each of us will work on transforming a course in which we have considerable experience developing, designing, and delivering. Josh Hinkle and Michael Shapiro are in charge of, respectively, transforming Policing in America and Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice. Dean Dabney and Scott Jacques will transform Social Science & the American Crime Problem, which is part of GSU's Core Curriculum (Area E3). Two of us will work on that course because it has, by far, the largest enrollment of any course in our curriculum, and expected to grow; larger enrollment increases the opportunity to cheat, in that there are more people with whom to share answers; and, thus, Dean Dabney and Scott Jacques will create a far greater amount of assessment questions and other tools than usual, allowing us to vary them within and between course sections, which will help prevent cheating. Leah Daigle and Marie Ouellet will transform Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice. Two of us will work on that course for two reasons: One, and as true of many social science curriculums, "stats" is the most difficult course as measured by DWF rates, so especially great care is needed to ensure student success. Two, it is possible that said difficulty is exacerbated by insufficient alignment with another course, Research Methods in Criminal Justice, so the transformation will also involve increasing their alignment.

Furthermore, and tying into our transformation activities, Scott Jacques has expertise in open educational resources (OER). This expertise stems from his involvement in three prior ALG grants, and also due to his work as Director of AYS Open. "AYS" is short for the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, which is our department's college. AYS Open is the college's initiative to provide and use more free information, such as OER. From working in this capacity, Scott Jacques has considerable knowledge of how to find, use, make, and evaluate OER. Thus, his role in the proposed transformation also includes guiding the other team members in adopting OER (or materials free via our library). Additionally, we will draw on others at GSU as needed (e.g., to confirm accessibility by students with disabilities). We have many personnel resources at our disposal, including our subject librarian, La Loria Konata; GSU's ALG Champion, Denise Dimsdale; and, experts in GSU's Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

For this transformation, we will replace our current for-purchase textbooks with texts that are free to us and our students (among others). There are three key steps, described below.

Step 1 is to identify and review textbooks for the four courses. To do so, we will search amazon.com and chegg.com, which are major providers of university textbooks. For the first ten books listed on each site for each course (excluding those "sponsored" on amazon.com), we will analyze their respective table of contents to identify their 1) major topics, 2) subtopics, and 3) ordering of those. The findings will be used to decide what topics and subtopics to cover in the courses, and in what order.

Step 2 is curating one or more texts for each topic (including its subtopics). The texts may be articles, chapters, books, or another type of publication (e.g., legal cases, government reports). To select between texts, we will take into account ALG's evaluation criteria: clarity, comprehensibility, readability, content accuracy and technical accuracy, adaptability,

appropriateness, and accessibility. For step 2, we will only consider texts that are open access (i.e., free to everyone), in the public domain (and thus also free to everyone), or available as unlimited e-versions via the GSU library (e.g., articles available via Galileo). Based on our preliminary evaluation (see next paragraph) of currently available no-cost texts, we do not think it will be necessary to take advantage of the “fair use” doctrine. However, should that change, USG’s Fair Use Checklist will guide our use of texts that are crucial but otherwise unavailable for free to students. Should there be any uncertainty about the fair use of a particular reading, we will consult copyright experts (e.g., GSU’s Gwen Spratt) about how to proceed.

As part of step 2, we will extensively evaluate potential no-cost texts to adopt in the targeted courses. To prepare this ALG proposal, we made a preliminary evaluation. The results make us fully confident that we can successfully transform the courses to no-cost and achieve our goals. The following ideas are based on the preliminary evaluation, and, though tentative, demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed transformation. For Policing in America, there is no textbook that is open access or in the public domain that we deem of sufficient quality to adopt. Instead, this course will likely lean on library-based texts. In the near future, our library will purchase an unlimited e-version of a new book, *The Cambridge Handbook of Policing in the United States*, that will be used in the course. Readings therein will be supplemented with articles from peer-reviewed journals available via the library. For Social Science & the American Crime Problem, we will replace the current books with those that are open access (e.g., *Protect Serve, and Deport; Good Guys with Guns*) or available via the library in unlimited e-versions (*Hurt: Chronicles of the Drug War; Hard Time*). They will be supplemented with articles available via the library. For Ethical Issues in Criminal Justice, the idea is to adopt an open access textbook, *Ethics in Law Enforcement* (BCcampus), and supplement it with articles available via the library as well as legal cases on the website of the Caselaw Access Project (Harvard Law School). For Statistical Analysis in Criminal Justice, we considered OpenStax’s *Introductory Statistics*, but it covers too many statistical techniques that are largely irrelevant to criminal justice research, and presents information in ways that are suboptimal for our student body. Instead, then, the course will become more dependent on lecture-based content. On GSU’s Learning Management System, known as iCollege (i.e., Brightspace, D2L), the instructors will provide pre-recorded lectures and accompanying materials (e.g., PowerPoints). Those materials will be accessible at all times by students, in both seated and online sections, making it possible for them to repeatedly review the material. They will be supplemented with a mixture of open access and library-provided articles or book chapters devoted to specific course (sub)topics.

Step 3. On iCollege, students will be guided to the curated texts. For a work that is open access or in the public domain, students will be directed to an external link that hosts the text. For works only available for free via the GSU library, students will be directed to an internal link that can be used to access the text. Should we resort to the fair use doctrine, the work will be uploaded in iCollege, with a clear warning to students that the work is copyrighted and not to be redistributed. As part of step 3, we will consult with CETL to optimize the organization and presentation of texts on iCollege. Among other considerations, this entails deciding how best to integrate and connect each text with other course activities.

With those steps complete, we will make our no-cost text selections publicly available in the form of LibGuides posted on GSU’s website. A LibGuide is a set of webpages that directs users to

resources on a particular topic or course subject. LibGuides are typically prepared by librarians and appear as university library webpages. At present, we do not intend to create course materials suitable for sharing on GALILEO Open Learning Materials, perhaps with the exception of Statistics in Criminal Justice. Should we create such materials, they will be shared on that website.

4. Quantitative and Qualitative Measures

The transformations' success will be assessed by obtaining and analyzing data bearing on (1) student satisfaction, (2) student performance, and (3) course-level retention. The same data will be collected on the pre-transformed (spring semester 2020) and transformed version of each course (fall semester 2020). An advantage of this team's prior involvement in ALG grants is that the following approaches are informed by those experiences, which included collaboration with GSU's Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL). Should any new unique needs arise in relation to the proposed transformation, we will work together and with CETL to develop extra tools to address those needs.

(1) Student satisfaction will be ascertained with two surveys. Both surveys include quantitative and qualitative components. The first student satisfaction survey is that administered by GSU to evaluate all course sections, every semester. In addition to facilitating within-course comparisons (pre-transformed versus transformed), this survey will allow us to make between-course comparisons. This is because for each course section, GSU automatically compares its averages to other sections of the same course (if more than one), all department course sections, and all college course sections. The survey generates quantitative data by asking students to evaluate each of the following from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree):

- The instructor followed the plan for the course as established in the syllabus.
- The instructor gave assignments relevant to the goals of this course.
- The instructor explained the course grading system clearly.
- The instructor was willing and able to answer students' questions.
- The instructor was receptive to students' and others' opinions. Test questions clearly related to course content.
- The instructor communicates effectively.
- The instructor was well prepared.
- The instructor demonstrated extensive knowledge of the subject.
- The instructor stimulated me to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses.
- The instructor's teaching methods aid students in understanding the material.
- The instructor provided helpful feedback on assignments. The instructor was accessible to students outside of class.
- The overall structuring and sequencing of topics in this course facilitated learning.
- Course assignments, including examinations, required creative and original thinking beyond mere memorization of material.
- I am pleased with how much I learned in the course.
- Considering the subject matter of the course, the instructor was effective as a teacher.

Also, students are asked to evaluate from 1 (Poor) to 5 (Superior):

- Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?

- What is your overall rating of this course?

Before presenting open-ended questions that prompt qualitative data, students are asked to choose a response category for the following:

- Generally, how many hours per week did you spend outside of class preparing for class? (0-2; 3-4; 4-8; 9-14)
- What is your grade point average at GSU? (4.3-4.00; 3.99-3.75; 3.74-3.00; 2.99-2.50; 2.50-0.00; New GSU Student (No GPA))
- For undergraduates only, which best applies to you? (freshman; sophomore; junior; senior; other)

Finally, qualitative data are produced by asking students to describe “Course strengths”; “Course weaknesses”; “Instructor strengths”; “Instructor weaknesses”; “Suggestions for course improvement”; “Suggestions for instructor improvement”; and, “Comments on classroom environment.”

The second student satisfaction survey is specific to textbooks. In collaboration with CETL, this survey was crafted to reflect the GSU-wide survey (see above) and garner further insight into textbooks. Within each course section, it will be delivered via iCollege during the last week of the course. First, the survey will generate quantitative data by asking students to evaluate each of the following from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree):

- Generally, I think textbooks are too expensive.
- Generally, I think the cost of textbooks is more than I can afford.
- Generally, I think students would do better in college if textbooks were less expensive.

For the pre-transformed courses, students are asked to evaluate the following with the same scale:

- For this class, I think buying the textbook(s) led me to learn more.

For the transformed courses, students are asked to evaluate the following with the same scale:

- For this class, I think I would have learned more if I had to purchase a textbook.

Because students may choose to buy a physical version of free digital textbooks, the following question applies to, and thus will be asked of, students in the pre-transformed and transformed courses:

- For this class, how much did you spend on the textbook(s)?
- For this class, how did you obtain the textbook(s)? For this class, how did you obtain the textbook(s)? (I didn't obtain it; Bought/rented from bookstore; Bought/rented from online seller; Bought/rented from individual you know; Borrowed from individual you know; Borrowed physical version from library; Free e-version via library website; Free e-version via non-library website; Other, describe.)

(2) Student performance will be determined in two ways. One is through student grades, including not only final grades but also those on specific topics (e.g., modules devoted to policing versus corrections), based on various assessment tools (e.g., quizzes versus discussion posts), at different points in the semester. This information will be available via iCollege, as instructors will solely use it to record grades.

The second way we will assess student performance is through a test that will not count toward student grades, but will measure their learning and, unlike the above grades, be developed and delivered in the same way across all four courses involved in the transformation. First, for each course, its learning objectives will be mapped to multiple-choice questions. These questions will reflect the essential knowledge that students should “walk away with” from taking a course. Then at the beginning, midpoint, and conclusion of each course, students will be given the test via iCollege. The results will allow us to measure progressive learning throughout the courses, and compare this progression across pre-transformed and transformed versions. Note that to counter testing effects, the questions found on any given test (e.g., that of Jane Doe at midpoint) will be drawn at random from a large question bank.

(3) Course-level retention will be determined with IPORT, which is GSU’s “web-based application that provides access to data stored in the University Data Warehouse” (<https://oie.gsu.edu/decision-support-services-dss/iport/>). For each GSU course section, IPORT has a daily record of how many students dropped it (or added it); the number of students who failed; and, the number of students who withdrew. These are just a few of the variables available via IPORT. We will use others, as appropriate, to better understand the range of factors that shape the effect of textbook costs on DWF rates, in addition to measures of student performance (e.g., mean, median, and mode of final grades).

5. Timeline

The timeline, immediately below, outlines dates at which course redevelopment actions will be completed.

- October 4, 2019: Notification of award.
- October 28, 2019: Kickoff Meeting attended by two or more team members.
- November-December 2019: For each course, compile textbooks and conduct a content analysis of their chapter and section contents, focusing on topic coverage and order in which topics are covered. Also, map learning objectives to multiple-choice questions that reflect the essential knowledge that students should “walk away with” from taking a course.
- January-May 2020: Based on findings of content analysis for each course, decide which topics to cover and in what order; identify, review, and select new reading materials; curate and develop non-reading materials; upload materials to iCollege. Consult with CETL to optimize organization/presentation of materials on iCollege; consider incorporation of other non-reading materials; and develop/integrate them as appropriate.
- June-July 2020: Finalize course syllabus and all materials; begin preparing LibGuides.
- August 2020: Begin delivering transformed courses; publish LibGuides.
- December 2020 and after: Based on findings (see assessment timeline, below), refine courses for future semesters.

The following timeline outlines dates at which course assessment actions will be completed. (For further details, refer back to section on Qualitative and Quantitative Measures.)

- December 2019: Upload tests on the knowledge to “walk away with” for each course; put everything in place that will be needed for data entry (e.g., data labels in statistical software program).
- January 2020: At semester start, administer “walk away with” tests; enter results into dataset.
- March 2020: At semester midpoint, administer “walk away with” tests; enter results into dataset.
- May 2020: At semester end, administer “walk away with” tests; provide students with student satisfaction survey that is specific to learning materials; enter those results, those from GSU-wide student satisfaction survey, and information on IPORT into dataset.
- August 2020: At semester start, administer “walk away with” tests; enter results into dataset.
- October 2020: At semester midpoint, administer “walk away with” tests; enter results into dataset.
- December 2020: At semester end, administer “walk away with” tests; provide students with student satisfaction survey that is specific to learning materials; enter those results, those from GSU-wide student satisfaction survey, and information on IPORT into dataset; analyze data; write and submit final report.

6. Budget

The requested budget is \$30,000. This total breaks down as follows:

Travel and overall project expenses, \$800.

Contract Overload:

| | |
|--------------------|-------------|
| 1. Scott Jacques | \$4,866.66. |
| 2. Dean Dabney | \$4,866.66. |
| 3. Leah Daigle | \$4,866.66. |
| 4. Josh Hinkle | \$4,866.66. |
| 5. Marie Ouellet | \$4,866.66. |
| 6. Michael Shapiro | \$4,866.70. |

7. Sustainability Plan

As outlined in the Statement of Transformation section, the proposed project will have a lasting impact on GSU students. When the project is complete, our department will have the distinction of using no-cost materials in (all sections of) the ten required courses for our major. This will establish our department as a model for others to emulate, all the more so as we move toward a Z-degree. In that vein, by sharing these courses with PhD student instructors, we equip them to spread the no-cost pedagogy to their future institutions. Furthermore, at the 2021 Annual Meeting of the American Criminal Justice Sciences (the major society/association of criminal justice academics), Scott Jacques will present the why, how, and effect of the department's transformation.

As part of the department's recent move to a collaborative teaching process, there is already a sustainability plan in place. It consists of a "blueprint" for each course that (1) shows when its no-cost version was, or will be, most recently created and delivered; (2) schedules, within two years, at least one faculty member and PhD student to update and otherwise improve the course; and, (3) schedules, within the next year, the updated version to be delivered. The process then repeats every three years. This sustainability plan ensures the maintenance and updating of our course materials.