

PH.D. PROGRAM IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
**CRJ 80100 – ADVANCED RESEARCH METHODS:  
PROGRAM AND POLICY EVALUATION**

FALL 2006

Thursdays 6:30 – 8:30 pm

Dr. Richard Culp  
Department of Public Management  
John Jay College of Criminal Justice  
445 West 59<sup>th</sup> Street (North Building)  
Room 3516

Office phone: 212-237-8929  
Email: [rculp@jjay.cuny.edu](mailto:rculp@jjay.cuny.edu)  
Office Hours: Tues & Thurs 4:00-6:00 pm  
and by appointment.

**Course Description:**

This course examines the important role that evaluation plays in furthering knowledge about criminal justice phenomena and the efficacy of social action undertaken to address them. While experimental research is primarily aimed at determining the causal relationships between specific variables, evaluation is more generally focused on determining whether particular interventions, in the form of policies and programs, are achieving their intended goals. Together, evaluation and research constitute the mainstay of professional criminal justice work. This course will provide a comprehensive look at the strengths and limitations of evaluation theory, design, and methodology as applied to criminal justice policies and programs. The goals of the course include: to provide students with sufficient knowledge and skills to conduct evaluation activities competently; and to inspire students to improve the quality of criminal justice programs and policy through the application of more systematic evaluation procedures.

**Required Texts:**

Peter H. Rossi, Mark W. Lipsey, & Howard E. Freeman, Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, Seventh Edition. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2004).

Michael E. Maxwell, Guide to Frugal Evaluation for Criminal Justice. (Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 2001). This document can be downloaded free of charge from: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/187350.pdf>

Elaine Morley, Scott P. Bryant, & Harry P. Hatry, Comparative Performance Measurement, Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press, 2001).

**Supplemental and Suggested Reading:**

In addition to the required texts, other readings will be assigned each week during the course (in addition to the readings listed in the syllabus). Most of the readings will be accessible online through the EBSCO host Academic Search Premier, Criminal Justice Periodical Index, or the Full Text Electronic Journals service of the Lloyd Sealy Library.

### **Course Requirements and Grading Criteria:**

Students are required to attend all scheduled classes, to complete all assigned readings in advance of class sessions, and to actively participate in class discussions. (Note: incurring more than two unexcused absences will result in a lowered grade; frequent tardiness will also lower the final grade). Students should discuss any extenuating circumstances that impede class attendance or participation with the instructor.

There will be two required writing assignments during the semester. The first paper will be a literature review and critique of published evaluations in a specific criminal justice subject area, to include a brief overview of each evaluation and its findings and a critique of the reliability, validity, and sensitivity of the measures used. The subject area to be examined will be mutually agreed upon by the student and the instructor no later than the fourth week of the semester. The completed paper (approx 2,500 words) will be due during the eighth week of the semester and will count toward 20% of the course grade. Additional guidelines for the paper will be presented in class.

The second writing assignment (approx 4,000 words) will be a model program or policy evaluation proposal. The model proposal will include the following elements: Program or policy description; discussion of program theory or logic model; role of stakeholders (and plan for engaging them); evaluation design; and an estimated budget and project timeline. The completed project will be due on the final day of class and constitute 50% of the course grade. Students will be expected to make an oral presentation of the model proposal to the class during the final two weeks of the semester.

There will be a short midterm examination (during the seventh week) that tests understanding of the language and concepts used in evaluation. The midterm will constitute 15% of the final grade.

The remaining 15% of the grade will be determined by the quality and consistency of student participation in the class.

Students are reminded to abide by accepted standards of scholarship by appropriately attributing the work of others in all work submitted for this course. For your reference, John Jay College of Criminal Justice's policy on plagiarism is reprinted at the end of the syllabus. Violations of this policy will result in a failing grade for the course.

### **Class schedule:**

August 31	Introduction – Overview of Evaluation Maxfield, Chapter 1 Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman (Hereafter, RLF) – Chapters 1 & 12
September 7	“Action research” and evaluation; intro to evaluation design. RLF – Chapters 2, 3, & 4

Wilson, J.A., & Davus, R.C. (2006). Good intentions meet hard realities: An evaluation of the Project Greenlight reentry program. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5 (2), 303–338.

Marlowe, D.B. (2006). When “what works” never did: Dodging the “Scarlet M” in correctional rehabilitation. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5 (2), 339–346

Rhine, E.E., Mawhorr, T.L., & Parks, E.C. (2006). Implementation: The bane of effective correctional programs. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5 (2), 347–358.

September 14 Program Theory: Evaluability Assessment and Logic Models

Maxfield, Chapter 2

RLF – Chapters 2, 3, & 4

Yampolskay, S., Nesman, T.M., Hernandez, M., & Koch, D. (2004). Using concept mapping to develop a logic model and articulate a program theory: A case example. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 25 (2), 191-207.

September 21 Process, outcome, and impact evaluations; measurement.

RLF – Chapters 6, 7, & 8

Maxfield – Chapters 3 & 4

In-class discussion of first paper topics

September 28 Comparative performance measurement, efficiency analysis, best practices and benchmarks

RLF – Chapter 11

Morley, Bryant, and Hatry – All

Review and be prepared to discuss the following resources:  
Campbell Collaboration (<http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/>)  
Blueprints for Violence Prevention  
<http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/index.html>

October 5 Policy and program effects

RLF – Chapter 9 & 10

Zhao, J., Scheider, M.C., & Thurman, Q. (2002). Funding community policing to reduce crime: Have cops grants made a difference? *Criminology & Public Policy*, 2 (1), 7–32.

Moore, M. H. (2002). The limits of social science in guiding policy. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 2(1), 33–42.

- Oettmeier, T. N. The pursuit of grants provides policy challenges for police executives. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 2(1), 43–50.
- October 12 Midterm (first half of class); policy and program effects, cont'd.
- Schmitt, G. R. (2006). Drug courts: The second decade. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. NIJ 211081
- October 19 Discussion of student literature reviews (First paper due)
- October 26 Thursday classes do not meet; Friday classes meet
- November 2 American Society of Criminology – Los Angeles – Nov 1-4
- November 9 Peering into the “black box”
- Mazwell, S.R. (2005). Rethinking the broad sweep of recidivism: A task for evaluators. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 4 (3), 519–526.
- Johnson, B. R. & Larson, D.B. (2003). The InnerChange Freedom Initiative: A preliminary evaluation of a faith-based prison program. Philadelphia, PA: Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society, University of Pennsylvania.
- Other readings to be assigned on the operationalization of concepts such as: restoration, collaboration, faith, belief, social capital, forgiveness, etc.
- November 16 In the end, it's all about implementation
- Mitchell, O., & Harrell, A. (2006). Evaluation of the Breaking the Cycle demonstration project: Jacksonville, FL and Tacoma, WA.. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 36 (1), 97–118.
- Sridharan, S, & Gillespie, D. (2004). Sustaining problem-solving networks. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 3(2), 221-250.
- November 23 No Class – Thanksgiving Holiday
- November 30 Student presentations
- December 7 Student presentations

*John Jay College of Criminal Justice's Policy on Plagiarism*

Plagiarism is the presentation of someone else's ideas, words, or artistic, scientific, or technical work as one's own creation. Using the ideas or work of another is permissible only when the original author is identified. Paraphrasing and summarizing, as well as direct quotations, require citations to the original source.

Plagiarism may be intentional or unintentional. Lack of dishonest intent does not necessarily absolve a student of responsibility for plagiarism.

It is the student's responsibility to recognize the difference between statements that are common knowledge (which do not require documentation) and restatements of the ideas of others. Paraphrase, summary, and direct quotation are acceptable forms of restatement, as long as the source is cited.

Students who are unsure how and when to provide documentation are advised to consult with their instructors. The Library has free guides designed to help students with problems of documentation.