

PH.D. PROGRAM IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
**CRJ 70900 - SURVEY OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE POLICY AND PRACTICE**  
SPRING 2005  
Thursdays 6:30 – 8:30 pm  
Room 636B

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 provides an introduction to major theories of the policymaking process, examines methods of policy analysis, and applies these theories and methods to the study of contemporary criminal justice issues. “Criminal justice policy and practice” can be broadly defined as the range of prescribed responses that emerge out of societal efforts to deal with the problem of crime. Policy analysis is an interdisciplinary project that draws theory and methodology from a number of fields, including philosophy, political science, criminology, sociology, psychology, economics, and public administration. We will consider how criminal justice problems are conceptualized and brought to the attention of policymakers, how policy unfolds, and how these responses are implemented, evaluated, and revised over time. Within this broad context, we will include the policies and practices of the formal criminal justice institutions (police, courts, and corrections) as well as efforts undertaken by the private sector and the institutions of civil society. Ultimately, the aim of policy analysis, and of this course, is to “develop and implement a framework for analyzing what has occurred, and as objectively as possible, to fashion alternatives for a succeeding and improved policy over its predecessor” (Houston & Parsons, 1998. p.15).

**Required Texts:**

Henry Ruth & Kevin R. Reitz, The Challenge of Crime: Rethinking Our Response. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

Eugene Bardach, A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. (New York: CQ Press, 2004)

**Supplemental and Suggested Reading: (see end of syllabus for partial list)**

In addition to the required texts, a number of readings will be assigned each week during the course. Most of the readings will be accessible online through the EBSCO host Academic Search Premier, Criminal Justice Periodical Index, or the Electronic Reserve services of the Lloyd Sealy Library. Students will also research and report on a list of readings related to individual term projects.

**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 – students should discuss with the instructor

any extenuating circumstances that impede class attendance or participation. Frequent tardiness will also lower the final grade).

There will be two required writing assignments during the semester. The first paper will be a literature review of a selected criminal justice policy issue. The completed paper (approx 1,000-1,500 words) will be due in the eighth week of the semester and will count toward 25% of the course grade. Guidelines for the paper will be presented in class. The second paper (approx 3,000-4,000 words) will be a policy analysis of a contemporary criminal justice problem. The analysis will consider alternative responses to the problem and recommend a specific course of action (including, if deemed appropriate, continuation of the present approach). Students are referred to Bardach (2004) for guidelines on conducting a policy analysis. The completed project will be due on the final day of class and constitute 50% of the course grade. All papers submitted for grading must be typewritten and double spaced using a standard 10-12 pitch font. Sources should be cited using APA format. For your reference, John Jay College of Criminal Justice's policy on plagiarism is reprinted at the end of the syllabus.

Students will also be required to make oral presentations of both papers in class. The oral presentations, along with weekly participation and attendance, will constitute 25% of the course grade.

#### **Class schedule:**

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| January 27  | Overview of the course and introduction to criminal justice policy and practice; Criminal justice science and public policy.<br>Gilsinan (1991).   |
| February 3  | Historical and contemporary context of crime response policy.<br>Ruth & Reitz (2003), p. 1-66; Garland (1996); Garland (2000).   |
| February 10 | Theories of the policy process – from disjointed incrementalism to policy networks.<br>Students will be assigned one (1) article from the supplemental reading list during the previous class session and provide an oral summary in class, e.g.:<br>Abrar, Lovenduski & Margetts (2000); Bybee (2001); Cope (2001); Fairchild (1981); John (2003); Kübler (2001); Nagel (1983); Rock (1995); Stolz (2001); Stolz (1984); Wilson (2001). |
| February 17 | Assessment and data analysis in the policy process; publicly available criminal justice data; methods of policy analysis.<br>Ruth & Reitz (2003), pp 39-66; Bardach (2005), pp. 1-105; peruse Sherman, et al. (1997).<br>Topic due   |
| February 24 | Cost-benefit analysis and criminal justice policy<br>Bardach (2004), pp. 107-121; Piehl & DiIulio (1995).  |
| March 3     | Police policy<br>Gould & Mastrofski (2004); Harcourt (2004); Fyfe (2004); Ruth & Reitz (2003), pp. 118-166.  |

- March 10      Crime control and civil society  
The “criminologies of everyday life” (rational choice, routine activities, situational crime prevention).  
Review: Garland (1996); Garland (2000); Ruth & Reitz (2003), pp 118-166.
- March 17      Gun policy  
Ruth & Reitz (2003), pp 167-205.  
Discussion of student literature reviews
- March 24      Thursday classes do not meet; Friday classes meet
- March 31      Prison policy  
Ruth & Reitz (2003), pp 92-117; Caplow & Simon (1999).  
Discussion of student literature reviews
- April 7        Drug policy  
Ruth & Reitz (2003), pp 206-249;
- April 14      Juvenile Crime policy  
Ruth & Reitz (2003), pp 250-282;
- April 21      Technology and the crime response complex  
Readings to be assigned  
Student presentations
- April 28      Spring Recess
- May 5        Student presentations
- May 12       Student presentations

### **Supplemental Reading:**

Abrar, S., Lovenduski, J., & Margetts, H. (2000). Feminist ideas and domestic violence policy change. Political Studies, 48, 239-262.

Bybee, K.J. (2001). The jurisprudence of uncertainty. Law & Society Review, 35, 4, 943-956.

Caplow, T. & Simon, J. (1999). Understanding prison policy and population trends. In M. Tonry & J. Petersilia, Prisons. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cope, S. (2001). Analysing criminal justice policymaking: Towards a policy networks approach? In M. Ryan, S.P. Savage, & D.S. Wall, Policy networks in criminal justice. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave

Fairchild, E.S. (1981). Interest groups in the criminal justice process. Journal of Criminal Justice, 9, 181-194.

- Fliter, J. (1996). Another look at the judicial power of the purse: Courts, corrections, and state budgets in the 1980s. Law & Society Review, 30, 2, 399-416.
- Fyfe, J.J. (2004). Stops, frisks, searches, and the constitution. Criminology & Public Policy 3, 3, 379-396.
- Garland, D. (1996). The limits of the sovereign state: Strategies of crime control in contemporary society. The British Journal of Criminology, 36, 4, 445-471.
- Garland, D. (2000). The culture of high crime societies: Some preconditions of recent 'law and order' policies. The British Journal of Criminology, 40, 347-375.
- Gilsinan, J. F., (1991). Public policy and criminology: An historical and philosophical reassessment, Justice Quarterly 8, 2, 201-216.
- Gould, J.B. (2004). Subject searches: Assessing police behavior under the US constitution. Criminology & Public Policy 3, 3, 315-362.
- Harcourt, B.E. (2004). Unconstitutional police searches and collective responsibility. Criminology & Public Policy 3, 3, 363-378.
- Howe, R.B. (1993). Incrementalism and human rights reform. Journal of Canadian Studies, 28, 3, 29-45.
- Kübler, D. (2001). Understanding policy change with the advocacy coalition framework: An application to Swiss drug policy. Journal of European Public Policy, 8, 4, 623-641.
- Lindbloom, C. E. (1979). Still muddling, not through yet. Public Administration Review, November/December, 517-526l.
- Nagel, S. (1983). Rationalism versus incrementalism in criminal sentencing. Policy Studies Review, 2, 1, 224-230.
- Piehl, Anne M. & DiIulio, John J. Jr., (1995). Does Prison Pay? Revisited. The Brookings Review, winter 1995, p.21.
- Rock, P. (1995). The opening stages of criminal justice policymaking. The British Journal of Criminology, 35, 1, 1-16.
- Sherman, L.W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. (1997). Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising. A report to the United States Congress, prepared for the National Institute of Justice, by the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Maryland. (Download available at: <http://www.ncjrs.org/works/>).
- Stolz, B. A. (2001). The criminal justice policy-making arena and privatization: Subgovernment in flux? In Shichor, D. & Gilbert, M.J. (Eds.) Privatization in criminal justice: Past, present, and future. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Stolz, B. A. (1984). Decarceration in Massachusetts: A study of disjointed incrementalism. Criminal Justice Review, 9, 53-62.

Wilson, C. (2001). Networking and the lobby for penal reform: Conflict and consensus. In M. Ryan, S.P. Savage, & D.S.Wall, Policy networks in criminal justice. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave

**Suggested Reading:**

Cole, G.F., Gertz, M.G. & Bunger, A. (2002). The criminal justice system: Politics and policies. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Hancock. B.W. & Sharp, P.M. (2000). Public policy, crime, and criminal justice. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Heineman, R. A., Bluhm, W.T., Peterson, S.T., & Kearny, E.N., (2002). The world of the policy analyst: Rationality, values, and politics (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: Chatham House.

Houston, J. & Parsons, W. W. (1998). Criminal justice and the policy process. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

Kingdon, J. W. (2003). Agendas, alternatives, and public policies (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Longman.

Sabatier, P.A., ed. (1999). Theories of the policy process. Boulder, CO. Westview.

Stolz, B.A. (2002). Criminal justice policy making: Federal roles and processes. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Walker, S. (2001). Sense and Nonsense about Crime and Drugs: A Policy Guide. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Welsh, W. N. & Harris, P. W. (1999). Criminal Justice Policy & Planning. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Company.

*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.