B U R E A U   O F   J U S T I C E

180988

The Annual Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation: Enhancing Policy and Practice

July 18-21, 1999

Summary of Featured and BJA-Sponsored Sessions and Workshops

Nancy E. Gist
Director

Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice

The Annual Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation: Enhancing Policy and Practice

July 18-21, 1999

Summary of Featured and BJA-Sponsored Sessions and Workshops

Acknowledgments

Contents

Workshops

Collaboration among criminal justice researchers and practitioners marked the 1999 Annual Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation: Enhancing Policy and Practice, July 18-21, 1999. The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) sponsored the conference through the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), and other OJP offices.

BJA-sponsored plenary sessions, panels, workshops, and roundtables featured topics such as street-level crime, building collaborations for research and evaluation, use of evaluation results, drug court partnerships, treatment services, delinquency prevention in schools, results from the Byrne Evaluation Partnership, and new evaluation frameworks for state and local programs. The report below details the presentations at these events and additional presentations at plenaries and luncheons.

Plenary and Keynote Sessions

Looking at Crime from the Street Level

Opening Remarks:
Nancy E. Gist, Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice
Sally T. Hillsman, Deputy Director, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice
Moderator:
Stephen Rickman, Director, Executive Office for Weed and Seed, U.S. Department of Justice
Presenters:
Richard Curtis, Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology, John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Sudhir Venkatesh, Professor of Sociology, Columbia University
Discussant:
Charles H. Ramsey, Chief, Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D.C.

Nancy Gist opened this session which applied the methodologies and perspectives of ethnographic work to criminal justice by welcoming participants. She noted efforts by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to build strong relationships with criminal justice practitioners, including the BJA Partnership Program, the Effective Programs Initiative, and the BJA Evaluation Web Site. She strongly encouraged conference participants to use the event as an opportunity to learn and to network in order to enhance future evaluation efforts. Sally Hillsman also noted the importance of the evaluation partnerships between researchers and practitioners and the commitment that the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has made to facilitate the partnerships.

Sudhir Venkatesh indicated that ethnography (the expressed meanings of actions to the actors) could be used alone or in conjunction with other research methods to improve understanding of elements of criminal justice. In particular, he asserted that efforts to explain street gangs and their behavior could benefit from application of ethnographic techniques. He then explained his own studies of community-based interventions with street gangs in Chicago.

Specifically, Mr. Venkatesh sought answers to two questions–(1) is street gang activity generated externally?, and (2) how can community intervention in gangs be effective? In seeking these answers, he tried to involve the community with gang members to create effective intervention efforts. He found, however, that relevant agencies frequently rejected the involvement as too dangerous and too much work. On the other hand, he also found substantial support for joint effort at the street level where the gangs operated and where community institutions such as churches and non-profits were already affected.

At the street level, the community institutions were willing to overlook some criminal activity by gangs in order to stabilize other activities in the community, if the gangs were willing to get the most undesirable activities out of selected areas. In this regard, the cooperation saw some success, limiting both public exposure to gang activity and recruitment of young members to gangs.

Demonstrating how ethnography can be wedded to more quantitative techniques, Mr. Venkatesh discussed how his street level observations were supplemented by written records and data. The gangs in his studies kept books accounting for the $280,000 per year that they took in, subdividing their assets and risks. He used the books to get a better idea of the drug distribution and gang organization spread throughout the area. He was able to track groups and their movements and costs in drug distribution markets at the street level. As a result, he found the high risk involved with gang membership, with each member on average facing a 25% chance of dying as well as two injuries and six arrests during their activity in their gang.

Mr. Venkatesh also found support for the "life course" model of gang involvement found in other literature. Gang organization was hierarchical, with members struggling to reach the top and receiving different sets of benefits as they progressed upward: in other words, a clear but limited career path existed within gang organization. By their early 20's, Mr. Venkatesh concluded, most gang members experienced disillusionment with their advancement in the gang hierarchy and began to recognize and seek opportunities outside the hierarchy.

These findings led to certain policy implications for criminal justice decisionmakers, in Mr. Venkatesh's view. First, understanding of the "life course" model should direct policymakers' attention toward the average low lifetime wages of gang activity for most members and toward policies with greater legitimate labor market opportunities and involvement. Second, these policies should focus on development of the general economy and not toward government job programs which do not offer long-term opportunities. Third, the street gang was clearly a "last resort" for most older gang members, who may be the most promising targets for the benefits of the economic development.

Richard Curtis also applied ethnography to street gangs in the Brownsville neighborhood of Brooklyn, New York. According to Mr. Curtis, ethnographers "study people's everyday lives," and he studied drug sellers and users. His research methods were time-consuming, and he came to know hundreds of New York drug sellers and users. Through his efforts he was able to compare his subjects over a prolonged period of time and to draw general conclusions about drug selling and use in New York.

According to Mr. Curtis, the steepest drops in drug crime in the period of his study came in the most crime-prone areas. Much of the decline came from changes in attitudes about drug and other crime among families, peer groups, and the general neighborhood over time. In the late 1980s, crack cocaine dealers began telling their fellow younger sellers not to use crack, and that message spread to non-drug arenas. As a result, aspirations to get into the drug market began to decline.

The style of dealers also changed, in Mr. Curtis' view. The older dealers did not know how to deal with success and brought on chaos. Newer dealers are more "control freaks," willing to use alcohol and/or marijuana in lesser degrees but not other drugs which cause more loss of control. The violence of the 1980s drug markets had also become more ordered and orderly, with fewer financial rewards, driving drug selling to a par with "flipping burgers." Perhaps as important, young women would no longer date drug dealers in the Brooklyn neighborhoods studied by Mr. Curtis.

In other words, according to Mr. Curtis, the communities themselves had generated conditions leading to fewer drug problems. Policymakers, on the other hand, have misread the new moderation, proclaimed "epidemics," and increasingly acted harshly on petty drug offenses. The social costs of this "war on drugs," in Mr. Curtis' view, have been extraordinarily high, and the war's unintended consequences will likely be higher than its expected benefits. One such unintended consequence is that newly released offenders from the 1980s-1990s drug wars are trying to return to a past that no longer exists. An "inversion of age and respect" may result, with younger people inside and outside the drug market treating the older offenders in ways that lead to future conflict and continued crime. According to Mr. Curtis, today's policies have an impact on the future, and policymakers should look at the long-term effects of today's actions and interventions.

In his discussion of the presentation through questions directed by moderator Stephen Rickman, Chief Charles Ramsey commented that it is hard to get a clear view of crime by gangs and drug dealers, people who significantly affect crime in his jurisdiction, the District of Columbia. He humorously wished that the New York offenders studied by Mr. Curtis could come to the district to get his offenders "the message."

According to Chief Ramsey, gang members and drug dealers are unemployable. Crime becomes a job as the only alternative, and the offenders use crime to maneuver up their "hierarchies." Chief Ramsey asserted that it is tough to crack a "thug mentality" and that research will help to deal with the marginal kids who are not yet committed to a criminal lifestyle. He agreed that in today's social conditions, survival requires crime for many with little access to legitimate opportunities. A strong economy with alternative opportunities, coupled with effective policing strategies, will help to bring crime down. He stated that it is not fully understood why crime increases or decreases or why crime cycles take place. Keeping crime down in the future will depend on working with and providing for the coming demographic bulge of young people. He also agreed that communities face many problems from the reentry of older released offenders into those communities, although he questioned whether the communities were very stable when the offenders were present.

Chief Ramsey opposed relaxation of existing drug laws. He emphasized that not enough dollars go into prevention and intervention and that too many dollars go into "locking people up." He believed that the biggest negative impact of relaxation of the laws would be on the poor and minority

communities. He disagreed about the cause of collapses of drug hierarchies, asserting that the younger replacements of "old guard" drug dealers have not been sophisticated enough to maintain the prior structure. Drug use is not lessening but is shifting among substitutable drugs as enforcement becomes more effective against particular drugs. That is, users of heroin or cocaine have moved to marijuana as a result of crackdowns on heroin and cocaine.

School Violence: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Research-Based Policy

Opening Remarks:
Jeremy Travis, Director, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.
Laurie O. Robinson, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.
Moderator:
Jeremy Travis
Presenters:
Joseph F. Sheley, Dean, College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies, California State University-Sacramento, Sacramento, California, "Violence Control in Schools: Survey Findings"
Ron Prinz, Carolina Distinguished Professor, Department of Psychology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina, "Research-Based Prevention of School Violence: A Developmental and Educational Perspective"
Sheppard G. Kellam, Professor, Prevention Research Center, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, "Community Board of Local Community, Organizational, and Institutional Leaders"

Following the welcome of conference participants by Jeremy Travis, Director of NIJ, Laurie Robinson, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), emphasized the importance of the consolidation of research and program evaluation and of the integration of research and practice. Under the 1994 Crime Bill supporting research and evaluation for OJP programs, eight hundred research initiatives representing $350 million had doubled the OJP research effort in recent years. The Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants in the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) also have provided routine set-asides for research and evaluation. Money for programming is now being used on related research and evaluation.

Assistant Attorney General Robinson presented her colleagues with two important concerns. First, she focused on the challenge for ensuring stable funding for research and evaluation. The two areas have only received a small percentage of OJP's total budget as officials have not been effective in presenting to Congress the significance of long-term projects in research and program evaluation. Second, she stressed the need to ensure that research dollars were focused and effective. Three of the five OJP bureaus have not always had complimentary and well-coordinated efforts in the past. Today, however, the efforts are more consolidated, in her view.

Joseph Sheley discussed findings from his "Survey to School Administrators to Reduce School Violence." The type of violence demonstrated at Columbine High School in Colorado in 1999 must be addressed, but with caution, because it is a very rare occurrence. His findings showed that it is

4

specific kids who avenge perceived wrongs. According to Sheley, the research must focus on assessing gun acquisitions and transportation to find correlates with these young people. The survey found that increases for risk to commit crime occurs among kids who are in relationships with kids involved in crime. Other findings showed that those juveniles with a long record of arrests have an increased risk of involvement in school violence, as do those who engage in drug sales and those who are involved in gangs. School violence is the worst in, but not exclusive to, urban areas. Also, children have the dangerous perception that guns and/or serious weapons are easily obtainable.

The prime motivator for gun activity is fear; this is the perception and the reality. The research is mixed on guns as status symbols, but that is not the primary reason for gun activity. Sheley asserted that the issue for administrators is that violence is determined by slights and social "taboos" and is situational and spontaneous.

The survey found that 19% of administrators perceived violence as a problem, while 2% perceived guns as a problem and 8% saw other weapons as a problem. Eighty-three percent of administrators report knife incidents, 58% report gun incidents, and 28% of administrators reported that students were shot in or out of school. The most common programs used to combat school violence are automatic suspensions, revision of disciplinary codes, locker searches, drug-free zones, and conflict resolution. Other techniques that are used include monitoring, police around and inside schools, and ID cards. Measures that were rarely used were video monitoring, metal detectors, and see-through book bags.

Mr. Sheley said that researchers need ways to feed information to practitioners. Meta-analysis of the growing number of studies must be done to inform the public. Enough schools are engaging in various anti-violence programs to provide an ample amount of data for useful case studies. Gaining cooperation with the schools is a must, although schools are becoming more wary of external examination. However, the violence prevention measures of community/school collaboration must be examined as well. In particular, researchers must ask what schools are doing to stop violence and what the community is doing to work with the schools.

Ron Prinz stated that research will inform policy and practice on prevention of school violence. From a developmental perspective, he emphasized the importance of focusing on elementary students, who will then apply lessons learned to junior high and high school, since elementary students show early precursors that cannot be labeled "violence." With this in mind, Mr. Prinz proposed a broad definition of violence consisting of two parts: (1) antisocial behavior such as bullying, committing verbal aggression, fighting, and exhibiting uncontrolled rage, and (2) acts of delinquency such as stealing, vandalizing, committing physical or sexual assaults, and using weapons.

Mr. Prinz discovered that early antecedents of antisocial/violent behavior are found in families, temperament, and peer groups. He also noted that there are social and environmental risk factors working against some kids, such as an escalation of behavior problems from home into the school. A few key points for intervention exist at which violence prevention programs can be most effective, including school entry, transition to adolescence, and infants in risky situations.

The role of theory is useful, according to Mr. Prinz. Theoretical assumptions about the development of risk for violence for intervention have been formulated. Programs must have a theoretical foundation, which must be tested. Practitioners need to keep intervening earlier and earlier in a child's life in multiple settings. Programs must move beyond focusing on the individual child and move to working with the larger community. Several factors determine a program's success: motivating the children, teachers, and parents, positive or negative modeling, setting and enforcing appropriate limits, involving the community, and providing adequate alternatives.

Mr. Prinz asserted that policymakers need scientific information from researchers so they do not simply follow fads. Policymakers must ask for information other than just outcomes and must also help schools increase resources and push for early intervention. School administrators must build and reward good behavior. They must realize suspension and expulsion are not effective. Administrators must examine and change the entire climate of the school. Behavioral scientists must see that the larger context of their work is important and that they need to build information bases with help from parents, teachers, and administrators.

Sheppard Kellam emphasized the importance of community intervention on local, city, and state levels. He stated that prevention science is based on three perspectives: (1) life-course development; (2) community epidemiology (population, variations); and (3) intervention trials. The goal in prevention studies is to promote social adaptation and psychological and physical well-being. Emphasis on social services, such as family intervention programs, which studies have indicated do work, is included in this intervention approach.

Mr. Kellam described five models for boards in the community which have been used to coordinate partnerships of institutions and individuals for community intervention: (1) neighborhood agency councils; (2) retail store models to represent communities in recognition of the leadership within the community; (3) volunteer boards; (4) elected community boards to bring together community leaders to create boundaries, involve schools, and set priorities; and (5) community boards of citizen organization leaders. These boards will enable citizens to develop valuable personal and professional relationships while suiting the political structures required to carry out prevention at that stage of work. As examples, he cited model community boards in Woodlawn, Illinois, and Baltimore, Maryland.

Mr. Kellam stated that programs must be institutionalized and priorities must be set for violence prevention programs to be successful. Prevention and intervention requires a community base, and, while that foundation takes a long time to build, it is extremely important.

Research on Women and Girls in the Justice System: Redefining Justice

Opening Remarks:
Robin L. Lubitz, Deputy Administrator, Discretionary Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.
Moderator:
Noël A. Brennan, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.
Presenters:
Beth E. Richie, Professor, Departments of Criminal Justice and Women's Studies, University of Illinois at Chicago, Senior Research Consultant, Institute on Violence, Inc., Chicago, Illinois, "Exploring the Link between Violence against Women and Women's Involvement in Illegal Activity"
Kay Tsenin, Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco, California, "Dealing with the Prostitution Problem in San Francisco"
Cathy Spatz Widom, Professor of Criminal Justice and Psychology, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New York, "Child Abuse and Neglect and the Derailment of Girls and Women"

Robin Lubitz welcomed conference participants and provided introductory comments on the topic of females in the criminal justice system. In 1997, 22% of arrests were females, and 6% of inmates held in correctional facilities were female. Even though the national crime rate is going down, the crime rate for females is going up. The female arrest rate for violent crimes rose 25% from 1992 to 1996. These factors have produced a call for action and more and better research. Developmental pathways are unique for girls, and risk factors such as sexual abuse, substance abuse, and teen pregnancy need to be examined. Mr. Lubitz stressed that OJJDP is committed to the issue, exemplified in their additional research and evaluation of effective programs. In particular, he emphasized the need to answer the question, what are the ways in which females commit crimes?

Noel Brennan announced that OJP was planning a symposium to examine the broad range of issues that affect women and girls. She stated though that there is no "silver bullet" and that the problem is extremely complicated because of the realities that face researchers and practitioners.

Cathy Spatz Widom stated that researchers and practitioners must think differently. She enumerated several female crime myths: female crimes have no bad effect on society, they are rare, they are sexual in nature, and there is no need to understand female crime. The girls and women involved in the criminal justice system are female offenders who commit ordinary crimes and who are most often not career criminals. The childhood victimization of females has huge consequences. This causes derailment of normal development. For girls and women that are abused and neglected, criminal behavior is not rare, their crimes are not predominantly sexual, status offenders usually escalate into more serious crimes, and a certain percentage of these girls develop anti-social lifestyles as adults and persist in chronic and serious criminal careers.

Ms. Spatz Widom conducted a longitudinal study of a large group of abused/neglected females compared to a control group of non-abused/neglected females who came before the court. Both groups were taken from young female offenders who came through the courts from 1967-1971 and primarily consisted of females from a low socioeconomic status (SES) level, a limitation on the study. Following the initial study of the young females, they were found and re-interviewed at age 27 and again at age 33.

The study found that the abused/neglected group was twice as likely to be arrested for juvenile or adult offenses, and they were 2.4 times as likely to commit violent crime. They showed an increased risk for offending. The relationship between violent crime and being abused/neglected was not deterministic, however; the abuse and neglect simply increased the risk for females to commit crime. Of the experimental group, 8% were chronic, career criminals, while none of the females in the control group exhibited that behavior. Ms. Spatz Widom's research proved that a subset of abused/neglected females do go on to become chronic, persistent offenders.

Running away, IQ deficits, lack of social control, relationships with delinquent friends, and a lack of social and/or psychological skills needed for successful development may cause derailment of abused/neglected females from more common life courses. Ms. Spatz Widom stated that researchers and practitioners needed to rethink the current model for dealing with this set of the criminal justice system. The explanations used to rationalize the derailment of abused/neglected girls are not adequate. These women are public health risks because chronic, persistent offenders exist and they transfer their behavior/health risks to their children. Ms. Spatz Widom emphasized the importance of early intervention to prevent derailment and to enhance development of healthier lives for this subgroup of females.

Kay Tsenin spoke about the complex harms of solicitation as it affects women as both defendants and victims. The women generally have a drug history, and their "johns" do not understand why they are involved in the criminal justice system. They see their role purely as a consumer. Many judges have the approach, "do the crime, do the time, and get tested." But the dilemma is more complex than that, according to Ms. Tsenin. Most women enter the sex trade for survival. They are both victims and survivors of abuse. Ninety percent of women involved in the trade have been victims of battery in their families, 70% were sexually abused between ages of 3 and 14, and 68% have been repeatedly raped. They are also in poverty, and they know that sex sells. It is the one commodity that they possess.

Prostitution used to be thought of as a victimless crime. Then it became a quality of life crime; people did not want it in their "backyards." It is not a victimless crime because the criminal justice systems can revictimize the prostitute. The system can also provide motivation and incentive to get out of the sex trade by diverting the women to specialized programs. Some of the most successful programs use survivors of the sex trade to talk to prostitutes in the system.

For women, recovery is not a quick process—they live in a sea of contradictions. To law enforcement, the key to the whole problem is the soliciting of sex. Arrests are directed at those who solicit, not their pimps, not the international sex traders, or any others more responsible. In San Francisco, officials spend $7.9 million per year to enforce prostitution laws, dollars that could be spent in better ways, in Ms. Tsenin's view. For example, the city also operates a trauma and recovery center run by former prostitutes and a program for "johns."

All of the parties involved are pulling in different directions. Ms. Tsenin stated that some possible remedies are to consider decriminalization, to enforce laws against pimps, and to look at society as a whole—society creates prostitution and "johns" demand services so the industry is continually fueled. A need exists for bilingual education in many areas, intervention and assistance to abuse

victims, drop-in short-term shelters, shelters for run-aways, and economic training and education for work.

According to Ms. Tsenin, the core issues that need to be addressed are: the women's abusers, the women's low self-worth and low self-esteem created by the sexual abuse, the use of sex as a commodity, and the perception of sex on demand as the male prerogative. Ms. Tsenin concluded that as long as a woman can be sold, no woman is free.

Beth Richie presented the need for broadening understanding of gender abuse and illegal activity. She stated that the groups that are most marginalized, the groups that are most vulnerable to substance abuse, and the groups that are most plagued by physical and sexual abuse are low income women of color. One to two million women are abused by their partners each year; 20-25% of all women have been abused at one point. Fifty-six percent of women know some individual in an abusive relationship, 37% of emergency room patients are victims of domestic violence, of whom 28% are admitted into the hospital, and 13% require major medical treatment. Socioeconomic status (SES), age, and cultural background all make a difference in how abuse affects women and how they are treated by law enforcement agencies. Women with a low SES, women who are young, and especially women who are lesbians are all more vulnerable to abuse because they do not trust the police or are not dealt with effectively by police.

Ms. Richie cited problems with the previous research on women in the criminal justice system. Few studies have examined aggregate abuse within the particular categories of women described above. In addition, the research has been driven by categories and measures that are predetermined by evaluators, not by specific groupings, such as abused/battered women. She perceived a need for new basic research on women involved in the system, including discussions on the nature and impact of violence against women and the kind of form that violence takes.

For example, there are higher rates of physical and sexual abuse and victimization among incarcerated women than their nonincarcerated counterparts. Most nonviolent offenses, usually involving drugs, are "survival" crimes and a means of escaping violent behavior. Very little research links violence and crime in women. Ms. Richie, therefore, cited a need to reconsider the categories "offender" and "victim."

Ms. Richie concluded that the strategies for intervention programs effective in dealing with gender abuse and its linkage to crime should include: (1) responding to involuntary crime as a consequence of abuse, (2) understanding how violence compels people to be involved in crime, (3) creating community-based programs/interventions, (4) compiling more qualitative research focused in more depth than the usual categories described above, (5) developing gender-specific programs, and (6) understanding how welfare policy affects family policy and health policy.

Luncheon Keynote

Jan M. Chaiken, Director, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, D.C., "Report on Crime and Justice: Trends and Issues"

Jan Chaiken presented data from the recent Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) reports, "Crime and Justice: Trends and Issues" and the BJS "Victimization Survey." He reported on trends that are less well-known than the overall decline in crime and victimization rates in recent years.

For example, property crime rates have dropped for at least the last 25 years, down 58% since 1975, a trend not duplicated in other nations. Burglary rates and auto theft rates have been up in England/Wales and in Canada. The England/Wales rates surpass those of the United States, but that fact has not drawn much research attention. Some of the reasons for the improvement in the United States, according to Director Chaiken, include more secure doors and windows; better illumination; private security; fewer cash transactions and less cash availability; more home entertainment keeping people in, burglars out, and robbers and assaulters without targets; and better research on and evaluation of the operation of property crime.

According to victimization surveys, between 1973 and 1998, incidents of rape, including rapes by intimates, have been cut 50%. Further, rates of violent crime with male victims have declined since 1973. Homicides of female victims by intimates have dropped since 1992, and homicides of male victims by intimates have decreased since 1976. The latter is best explained by the rise of safe houses and other alternatives for women abused by their partner who previously had mainly assault and murder as their alternatives.

Incarceration rates have quadrupled in the last 25 years, disproportionately for some subgroups, strengthening disrespect for law in their communities and disenfranchising a large percentage of potential voters. African-Americans make up the subgroup most affected by the increased incarceration and correctional supervision. Three times as many blacks as Hispanics are under correctional supervision, ten times as many as whites. In 1996, a 16-year-old male had a 5.1% chance of being sentenced to prison. If white, that sixteen-year-old American male had a 4.4% chance; if black, a 28.5% chance. Director Chaiken ended the presentation with a question to the audience about the likelihood of that trend continuing in the future.

Panel Sessions

Building Collaborations for Research and Evaluation

Moderator:
Daniel Sansfacon, Senior Analyst, International Centre for the Prevention of Crime, Montreal, Canada
Presenters:
Theimann H. Ackerson, Programs Coordinator, New Hampshire Department of Corrections, Concord, New Hampshire, "The Consortium: A Tri-State Collaboration for Applied Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation"
Arthur H. Garrison, Criminal Justice Planning Coordinator, Research and Program Evaluation, Delaware Criminal Justice Council, Wilmington, Delaware, "Building Evaluation Partnerships: Four Program Evaluations Conducted by the Delaware Criminal Justice Council"
Thomas McEwen, Director of Research and Managing Principal, Institute for Law and Justice, Alexandria, Virginia, "Evaluation of the Locally-Initiated Research Partnership Program"

Thomas McEwen spoke about the Locally-Initiated Research Partnership Program sponsored by OJP. Forty-one grants have been awarded under the program in the past three years for projects to develop equal partnerships between researcher/university organizations and the police departments. This changed the old routine in which the researcher was in control, according to Mr. McEwen.

For example, the Seattle Police Department partnered with the School of Public Health and Community Medicine of the University of Washington in efforts to determine how domestic violence is organized. They developed four partnerships based on domestic violence issues focusing on data collection and improving information systems. They developed and tested a "lethality" scale to measure domestic violence which aimed at prioritizing cases and served as a risk-assessment tool.

Another example is the Philadelphia Police Department's partnership with Temple University in various projects. The first project involved assessment of community policing at administrative, patrol, and community levels. The second project involved the evaluation of a "COPS AHEAD" grant, using focus groups, analysis of official records, surveys, interviews, and observations of police stations.

Of the 41 partnerships with the police, 33 were with a university, 7 were with a non-profit, and 1 was with an association. Eight of the 41 partnerships were with more than one police department; the average grant size was $128,900. Research projects included 15 evaluations of community police, 13 implementations of community police, 6 computer mapping CompStat replications, 4 domestic violence projects, and 3 multiple activity projects.

The projects fit the combined special interests of the researcher and the police department. Mr. McEwen presented an action research model as a practical approach for how researchers and the police can work together as partners. Action research is aimed at solving selected local problems, conducting general research with focus on specialized areas as needed, orienting projects to local organizational culture, focusing on organizational culture, making less use of experimental designs, and employing a mixture of qualitative and quantitative techniques.

According to Mr. McEwen, factors for a successful partnership include: (1) key personnel who remain in place and a low turnover rate; (2) researchers who acquire an understanding of local police culture, and who have a philosophy of implementing community policing in a political environment; (3) partnerships that develop effective relationships; (4) trust between police and researchers, in which the researchers "pay their dues" for acceptance, the public overcomes suspicions of the researcher, and the researcher earns a reputation for objectivity; (5) effective use of graduate students; (6) a quality local information system to support the research; (7) local projects and reports to fit the audience; and (8) participants learning the role of research in decisions.

Arthur H. Garrison discussed the partnership between the Delaware Criminal Justice Council and the University of Delaware School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy, which conducted four evaluations on four programs funded with Byrne Memorial Grant funds. (1) The Kent County Community Justice Center instituted a victim/offender mediation program for nonviolent offenses, with a mediated settlement compliance rate of 93.6% for adults and 100% for juveniles. (2) Operation Safe Streets is a joint probation enforcement program involving the Wilmington Police Department, Delaware State Department of Corrections, and Department of Youth Rehabilitative Services. The program reduced shootings in Wilmington more than 50%. Between June and September 1997, during the implementation phase, a 70.6% reduction of shootings occurred, a 4.7% decrease from 1996. (3) A juvenile justice diversion program was created in which youths who have committed nonviolent crimes can be heard before a panel of community residents. The panel determines if sanctions are appropriate, and if so and if the youths complete these sanctions, the case in Family Court is dropped. This program had a 96% compliance rate among participants. (4) A heroin addiction treatment program involving the use of naltrexone managed to get 75% of its participants drug-free while remaining in the program; 13% successfully completed it.

Mr. Garrison then provided advice to his colleagues about how to make evaluation relevant to policy makers: (1) Evaluation has to answer the "so what" question. (2) The recommendation section of the report should offer answers on issues of evaluation, such as whether the program should be continued or changed. (3) Evaluators should make recommendations easy to read, limiting charts to one per page, and leaving space within the text. (4) Evaluators should use text boxes that wrap around the text to highlight the main points, double spacing, 12-point and easy-to-read fonts, and short sentences. (5) Evaluators should create a short one- to two-page executive summary that reflects the important issues (program theory, set up, why it works, impact, goals/objectives). (6) Evaluators should use bullets, use headers/sub-headers, and end notes. (7) Evaluators should provide a literature review to give the results context. (8) Evaluators should put results in a positive light. (9) Good evaluation takes time.

Theimann H. Ackerson presented the Tri-State Collaboration for applied criminal justice research and evaluation. He began by questioning the existence of the tension of academia and criminal justice. The Northern New England Consortium for the Study of Prevention and the Control of Crime brought together the states of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont and focused on providing applied research and evaluation resources for the three member states. Mr. Ackerson spoke of the development of the consortium and its need for infrastructure. The consortium struggled with how to meet the needs of faculty, bureaucrats, and practitioners in one entity, especially when it could not put much infrastructure money into research projects. It became a "Catch 22" in which the

consortium had to show results before the infrastructure would be supported and constructed. Although the three states were not always very similar, they could nevertheless develop evaluation research applicable to rural states. However, each state required different types of support to contribute successfully to the consortium.

Findings and Results from State and Local Evaluations

Moderator:
Michael Connelly, Director of Special Projects, Justice Research and Statistics Association, Washington, D.C.
Presenters:
Edward W. Gondolf, Associate Director of Research, Mid-Atlantic Addiction Training Institute, Professor of Sociology, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Pennsylvania, "Impact of Mandatory Court Review on Batterer Program Compliance"
Erica Turley, Research Analyst, Statistical Analysis Center, West Virginia Division of Criminal Justice Services, Charleston, West Virginia, "Impact of Recent Changes in West Virginia's Adult Transfer Law"
Pinky S. Wassenberg, Associate Professor of Political Studies, Faculty Associate, Center for Legal Studies, University of Illinois at Springfield, Springfield, Illinois, "Evaluation of the Homicide and Violent Crime Strike Force in Madison and St. Clair Counties, Illinois"
Kim English, Research Director, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Denver, Colorado, "Evaluating Bryne-Funded Programs in Colorado"

Edward Gondolf looked at the effect of placing male batterers into mandatory 30-day court-reviewed programs. The compliance rate in these programs historically has been low: 50% of those assigned never appear; 40-60% drop out; and only 25% complete the program. Mr. Gondolf discussed an evaluation of batterers' programs in domestic violence courts in Pittsburg. Men referred to battered programs had to reappear in court in 30 days to prove participation in a 12-week batterer group counseling program, then had to return in 90 days to prove completion. The evaluation used a naturalistic, pre-post design. Two groups were sampled–a control group of 100 men appearing in court in the year prior to implementation (1994) and a sample group of men appearing in court in 1997, two years after the implementation.

Compliance outcome was judged at the levels of program intake, program completion, and total compliance. The data sources used were court dockets, program records, samples of court cases and program enrollees, and court observations. The compliance rates showed a dramatic change in program intake (cases referred to the court), from 64% in 1994 to 94% in 1997. The program completion rates were relatively constant (74% in 1994 and 69% in 1997), while total compliance increased from 48% to 65%.

Mr. Gondolf observed several changes--a reduction in police arrests, a reduction in program referrals, and heightened implementation. The major impact, however, was a 50% increase in the intake of batterers. Gondolf concluded that perhaps shorter batterer programs are just as effective as long ones and possibly a pre-trial component would be successful. The program must be put into the context

of the relationship between the program and the court and of the impact that court procedures can have on program outcomes.

Erica Turley discussed changes in West Virginia's adult transfer law, permitting some juveniles committing certain designated offenses to be tried in adult courts. In 1995, the minimum age of transfer to adult courts in West Virginia was lowered from 16 to 14 for certain offenses. The Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center of West Virginia examined the effects of these changes on juveniles and juvenile justice practitioners in West Virginia. From January 1992 to July 1995 7% of juveniles were transferred to adult court in the state, while in 1997, 19% were transferred. Eighty-five were males; 54% had been charged with first degree murder. Of the practitioners surveyed, 78% favored the change in the law. The more experienced the practitioner, the more likely he or she was to favor the change. Law enforcement officials surveyed unanimously supported the law; 90% of public defenders surveyed did. The majority of workers in juvenile shelters were opposed to the law, as were the majority of public defenders.

Pinky Wassenberg presented her findings from the Evaluation of the Homicide and Violent Crime Strike Force in Madison and St. Clair counties in Illinois, primarily East St. Louis. The strike force was a collaborative effort between law enforcement and prosecutors. It was intended to focus on homicide and violent crime cases that were at least three years old. The goals of the strike force were to obtain experienced homicide investigators with relations within the particular communities in which the homicides occurred, to assist local prosecutors in the prosecution of strike force cases, and periodically to take the lead in the prosecution of selected cases. Regarding the final goal, the strike force hit a "bump in the road" early on when the Attorney General's Office made a mistake in appointing the directing prosecutor. This created tension between the prosecutor and the rest of the law enforcement staff, a tension exacerbated by politics. From this experience, Ms. Wassenburg stressed that attention must be paid to political nuances by jurisdictions planning similar strike forces in the future.

A joint process and outcome evaluation, funded with Byrne Grant money by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, identified: (1) the original goals and objectives of the strike force, its initial operating procedures, structure, and resources; (2) the evolution of the strike force; and (3) the impact of the strike force on cases, law enforcement, prosecutors, and the communities in which the strike force operated.

The strike force opened 72 cases, most involving murder charges. Removing seventy-two cases from the caseloads of local law enforcement assisted those jurisdictions substantially in marshalling their limited resources. The strike force may also have fostered an environment of positive competition in which local law enforcement more aggressively pursued its remaining cases.

The strike force also assisted local prosecutors by providing more experienced personnel to develop homicide prosecutions, in particular a retired homicide detective who already knew key cases to investigate. This increased the region's capacity to deal with homicide and violent crime. The eventual success in prosecuting most strike force cases made local officials more willing to pursue other old cases developed by the strike force.

East St. Louis, the primary focus of strike force efforts, experienced a significant drop in homicide rates in the period of the strike force activity, and violent crime indicators were down in both counties under the strike force's jurisdiction. The strike force could not take full responsibility, but was a definite contributor to the declines in the eyes of the participants, according to Ms. Wassenburg.

Kim English talked about evaluating Byrne-funded programs in her state and a recent study investigating the factors that are linked to successfully institutionalizing a Byrne program. The study showed that the Byrne programs that get institutionalized have two things in common: they are around for three years, and the district attorney is involved. This showed that a mixture of good program management and politics can sustain a program.

When evaluating specific programs, Ms. English recommended that the following questions be asked: what works, for whom, and under what conditions? According to Ms. English, the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice's approach to evaluation was as follows: (1) evaluate one program at a time; (2) realize the jurisdiction cannot separate out the impact of Byrne funds, other federal funds, and state/local funds; (3) identify key local issues that program evaluation can shed light on; and (4) conduct participatory evaluations that prioritize and receive input from staff to create ongoing feedback.

Ms. English also recommended finding out what the funding sources want you to do and what issues to work on with the program administrator and advisory groups. Evaluators should incorporate both process and outcome evaluation so they know what funding particular operations accomplishes. She stated that the next hot issues for federal funding would likely include: (1) community notification of sex offenders; (2) effectiveness of school resource officers; (3) cost analysis of sentencing options for drug/violent offenses; (4) process evaluations of drug court; and (5) risk assessment.

Ms. English also stated that sometimes it is important for evaluators to document even something they and program practitioners already know. This helps to give evaluators more power when they are discussing the value of certain programs. Another technique she recommended was to narrow broad findings to make them relevant to specific situations.

BJA Partnerships Between Evaluators and Program Managers on Drug Courts

Moderator:
Kathleen R. Snavely, Director of Research, National Drug Court Institute, Alexandria, Virginia
Presenters:
Paul Stageberg, Justice System Research Specialist, Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning, Des Moines, Iowa, "Polk County (Iowa) Drug Court: From an Evaluator's Perspective"
Edward Cahoon Byrnes, Principal Investigator, Valley Mental Health's Adolescent Residential Treatment and Education Center, Salt Lake City, Utah, "Recidivism, System Penetration, and Participation in the Utah Juvenile Drug

Court Program"

G. Edward Wensuc, Manager, Statistical Analysis, Office of Research and Statistics, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Denver, Colorado, "Denver Drug Court"

Paul Stageberg spoke about the establishment of a drug court in August 1996 in Polk County, Iowa. In early 1997, funds were available through a contract obtained by the Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning for an evaluation of the program. The funds will be available through September, 2000 and will provide a framework for evaluation for the period of the contract. Evaluators are tracing three group—an experimental group composed of both successful and unsuccessful participants, and two control groups (one group composed of rejected participants and one of offenders screened before 1996).

The planning and development of the drug court began in 1994, with representatives from probation, corrections, the judiciary, and community groups, and the grant was awarded in 1995. The goal of the drug court was to provide an assessment of treatment that reduced recidivism and jail time and that cut caseloads. Polk county drug courts are staffed by a judge, probation officers, a public defender, and a county attorney and provide treatment alternatives for men and women accused of drug offenses. Most of the people who came through the drug courts had already been involved in the criminal justice system and were currently on parole, which greatly affected the success rate.

Referrals to the courts presented an immediate problem. The grant application proposed "dual diagnosis" of clients in terms of both their drug use and their mental health; however, the program did not have the capacity for the target population. A mental health specialist was needed so the courts could not refer mental health problems in a timely fashion. Resources in Polk County also presented a problem. There was a waiting period for programs during which people were not put in jail. Also, the staff turnover was high, judges rotated often, and the drug court reflected the personality and philosophy of the judge. According to Mr. Stageberg, drug courts need a judge sincerely interested in the program.

The intention of the drug court was to target probation cases, making the Polk County drug court unique. Eighty-four of 128 referrals came from probation revocation, so the failure rate was higher. Polk County is in the upper Midwest and suffers a severe methamphetamine problem, in addition to the more common problems of marijuana and cocaine. Methamphetamine was the drug of choice 58.5% of the participants, while 31.7% preferred cocaine. Marijuana use in the county began between the ages 13 and 15, cocaine use between 16 and 20, and methamphetamine use between 21 and 30. The average age of referral to the drug court was 29.8, resulting in a client with a lengthy drug history who was not easy to deal with.

Clients had difficulties forming relationships. Many were divorced, co-habited, and single; this was more true for females than males. Twenty-two of 65 males and 9 of 58 women had no children. Of those who had children, men had an average of 1.3 children and women, an average of 2.1. Although they had children, it was also evident that they failed to support them.

Edward Cahoon Byrnes discussed recidivism, system penetration, and participation in the Utah Juvenile Drug Court (JDC) Program. Through May 1999, the program had served 268 clients since

its beginning in October 1995, 76% of whom had graduated.

Evaluators compared program participants with 144 youths not involved in drug courts who were selected from the Utah Juvenile Information System database. They were similar to program participants in that they had initial contact with the juvenile court for alcohol and drug charges around the same time, had the same range of charges, and were similar in age and ethnicity. This study compared JDC graduates, JDC non-graduates, and the non-JDC group.

In the one-year follow up analysis, of 208 youths chosen for the study, 99 were JDC graduates, 27 were participants who were unsuccessfully terminated, and 82 were from the comparison group who would have been discharged for one year. JDC youths had a one-year recidivism rate of 19% for alcohol and drug charges and 32% for criminal charges. The differences between the three groups on alcohol and drug and criminal charges were significant, with the unsuccessful group differing from the graduates and comparison group in both analyses. There were also differences in home and secure detention placements at one-year follow-up.

In the two-year follow up analysis, of 159 youths remaining for study, 59 were JDC graduates, 18 were participants who were unsuccessfully terminated, and 82 were from the comparison group who would have been discharged for two years. JDC youths had a two-year recidivism rate of 39% for alcohol and drug charges and 42% for criminal charges. The differences between the three groups on alcohol and drug and criminal charges were significant, with the comparison group differing from the treated groups on alcohol and drug charges, and all groups differing on criminal charges at two years post treatment. There were also differences among the three groups in placements in the Division of Youth Corrections home and or in secure detention at two-year follow-up. Recidivism rates increased, but non-graduated were twice as likely to have drug/alcohol arrests after one year; however, differences from the other two groups narrowed after two years. Graduates of the JDC program performed significantly better on measures of non-drug use than the other two groups.

G. Edward Wensuc described the Denver Drug Court, which was begun in July 1994 to address the issue of alcohol and drug use and its impact on criminal activity. Prior to performing an outcome evaluation, the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice conducted a process evaluation to create profiles of drug offenders before and after the Denver Drug Court was established to determine whether it was accomplishing its goals and objectives. The evaluation would provide useful information to stakeholders and policymakers concerning drug courts. Mr. Wensuc presented nine research questions on drug courts in Colorado:

> (1) Have case processing times decreased between pre-drug court (1993) and drug court (1999) days? Yes, for offense to disposition (169 days to 106) and arrest to disposition (163 days to 109).
> (2) How do the demographic profiles compare between pre-drug court and drug court days? There are only a few statistically significant differences. In 1996 there was greater residential stability and more full-time employment, with one exception in the higher Hispanic population.
> (3) How do trends in Denver drug cases differ from state/local drug cases? The number of cases in Denver more than doubled between 1993 and 1995. The 105% increase was three

times larger than for drug cases in Colorado in jurisdictions outside Denver.

(4) Are more individuals receiving deferred judgments in drug court? Yes, 6.3% in 1993 and 23.5% in 1995, consistent with the treatment-oriented goals of the drug courts.

(5) Do differences exist between 1993 and 1995 in the types of drug charges issued? Yes, especially for heroin use–4% in 1993 and 23.7% in 1995.

(6) What is the impact of the drug court on practices such as sentencing and plea bargaining? There is a greater percentage of offenders receiving a formal probation placement (from two-thirds of offenders to three-fourths). There is greater probability that the disposition will reflect the overall charge.

(7) Has the drug court had an impact on case processing times? As noted earlier, case processing times have decreased significantly for the Denver Court. During this same period, in jurisdictions outside Denver case processing times actually increased.

(8) Have changes occurred within drug courts over time? Yes, the court now has its fourth presiding judge. Each judge has pressed his own signature on the court. Changes have also occurred in programming (education) and policies (closer working with the Immigration and Naturalization Service).

(9) What are the preliminary outcomes for the drug court participants as measured by adherence to treatment? Eighty-one percent of the offenders remained in treatment for the first six months. Fifty-six percent failed to appear for a urine analysis test, receiving incremental sanctions.

Future research on the Denver Drug Court will focus on outcome evaluation and survival analysis. Program outcomes, treatment outcomes, recidivism and its different definitions, and release environments (whether the person remains outside of criminal justice) will also receive more attention in future evaluations.

Assessment of Delinquency Prevention in Schools

Moderator:
Joanne Wiggins, Program Analyst, Planning and Evaluation Service, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
Presenters:
Denise C. Gottfredson, Professor, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland
and
Gary D. Gottfredson, President, Gottfredson Associates, Inc., Ellicott City, Maryland, "What Do Schools Do to Prevent Problem Behavior and Promote School Safety: How Well Do They Do It?"
Irene Hantman, Westat, Rockville, Maryland, "Identifying the Policy-Relevant Factors That Distinguish Safe and Unsafe Schools"
Paul Kingery, Director, Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence, Rosslyn, Virginia, "Directions for Future Research on School Violence"

Gary Gottfredson noted that for the first time, NIJ has sponsored a comprehensive description of what schools do to promote a safe, orderly environment and prevent delinquency, drug use, and gang involvement among their students. Gary and Denise Gottfredson were part of a group analyzing a large national sample of schools to see what kind of violence prevention measures they performed. In the spring of 1997, a large national sample of almost 900 high school principals was taken. The principals identified people who could adequately describe the violence prevention programs at their schools and who could subsequently be surveyed. One year later, in spring 1998, an activity coordinator survey, a teacher survey, and a student survey were completed. The study involved a comprehensive classification of all activities. For example, the researchers broke program efforts into categories such as the architectural features of schools, including separate halls or floors for 6th, 7th, and 8th graders, and the reorganizing of school schedules. The researchers also examined the nature and quality of program implementation. Schools differed by how much the entire school was involved in the program and whether a prevention curriculum providing instruction, counseling and social work was offered.

The study identified 14 unique prevention activities performed by school programs, with counseling, social work, and a prevention curriculum most prevalent. The quality of each program was measured with factors such as the use of best practices, the extensiveness of program application, and the amount of victimization. The adequacy of the measures was judged by a set standard—the minimum threshold to recommend if schools considered continuing or ending the program. The hypothesis of the study was that many factors such as staff morale, organizational capacity, school leadership, and leadership and instruction in the classroom would affect the success of violence prevention programs.

Mr. Gottfredson then presented an account of school violence programs in the form of a report card on programs and other structured activities. Many of the activities that schools are participating in are not effective. The empirical predictors to the quality of the program are: the extent and quality of training in the program, supervision of activities, principal support for the activities, the degree of structure and planning in the program, local responsibility for initiating the program, and external support from the community. Local initiation of prevention activity, high school morale, and extensive planning were associated with extensive prevention activity, Mr. Gottfredson said.

Irene Hantman, the next presenter, provided an elaboration of the national study of delinquency prevention in schools. She proposed six research questions: (1) What is the incidence of criminal and noncriminal disorder, especially violence, in schools nationally? (2) What types of efforts are underway in schools nationally to prevent criminal and noncriminal disorder, especially violence? (3) How well are violence prevention efforts implemented? (4) To what extent do schools use sound planning processes and information on school violence and violence prevention efforts to improve school management? (5) What sources of funding do schools use to support violence prevention efforts? and (6) What are the policy-relevant characteristics and processes that distinguish safe and unsafe schools?

Ms. Hantman discussed relevant policy issues: (1) How can federal agencies better target prevention funds? (2) How are prevention funds utilized? Are they useful? Are they used in sensible ways? (3) What are the best measures of disorder in schools?

The study design included three-tiered nested data collection with each subsequent phase expanding the knowledge base: (1) Phase I: National survey of principals at 886 schools on range of prevention activities in place in schools (performed by the Gottfredsons); (2) Phase II: National survey at 634 schools of principals, program providers, teachers, students, and local education agency (LEA) officials on prevention activities and school disorder (also performed by the Gottfredsons); and (3) Phase III: Site visit to 40 schools to collect interview and survey data from principals, teachers, students, program providers, security personnel, and LEA officials on prevention activities and school disorder (performed by Westat). Ms. Hantman focused on Phase III.

The researchers created rates of school safety based on school perceptions, student victimization, teacher perceptions, teacher victimization, and number of incidents reported to the police, with data derived from the principal survey. They then clustered schools by characteristics including urbanicity (urban, suburban, rural), education level (middle school, high school), and size (small, large). From this pool of schools, the researchers selected most and least safe schools within clusters for final study.

The research questions for Phase III were: (1) How well are violence prevention efforts implemented? (2) To what extent do schools use sound planning processes and information on school violence and violence prevention efforts to improve school management? and (3) What are the policy-relevant characteristics and processes that distinguish safe and unsafe schools?

Several data sources were examined in the site visits: student surveys, student focus groups, teacher surveys, teacher focus groups, principal interviews, program provider interviews, security staff interviews, district administrator interviews, and school record abstracts (characteristics and incident data). The researchers grouped the programs by education/instruction, controlling student's behavior, counseling, keeping kids busy, and training for staff that is explicitly intended to prevent problem behavior.

To evaluate the programs, the researchers used a program matrix consisting of three parts: (1) *Quality of implementation*: Is there a manual/plan/documentation? What are the goals? What is the duration and frequency intensity of the service provided? When is program delivered? How many students are involved? How is the program staffed? What kind of training is provided to program staff? How is the program funded? Is the program evaluated? Is there a match between plan and actual activity? What are the perceptions of student and staff? (2) *Predictors of program quality:* How were staff recruited? How committed/enthusiastic are staff? Who is the focus of the program? How was the program initiated? and (3) *Miscellaneous*: What type of activities are in the program? and How much program leadership exists?

The researchers also examined other characteristics of schools: (1) What kinds of strategies do schools use to prevent problem behavior? (2) What kinds of security devices do schools use to prevent problem behavior? (3) What kinds of rules do schools have to prevent problem behavior? How are the rules communicated to staff and students? What are the consequences of the rules? How frequently are the rules violated? How consistently are the rules enforced? (4) What other practices are schools using to prevent problem behavior?

20

When completed, Westat's final report will: (1) describe the role of programs in preventing school disorder; (2) describe the role of general school management (and principal leadership) in preventing school disorder; (3) accurately describe the extent of the school violence problem; and (4) describe how to focus prevention resources.

Paul Kingery provided his insights on the directions for future research on school safety. He insisted that the public was not doing a good job protecting kids in schools. Problems exist from a lack of accountability as individuals hide information, such as situations in which kids protect their friends, administrators do not want to reflect poorly on the school, or people just do not want to admit to problems. However, the demand for school safety is immediate and pressing, in Mr. Kingery's view. We need to look for the first step and prioritize. He stated that action should begin in the schools, then families, and lastly the communities and that programs should start with manageable objectives.

The most critical need is to collect, evaluate, and synthesize what is already "known" in schools through imperfect processes of trial and error. The Departments of Justice and Education issued the first "Annual Report on School Safety" in 1999. However, this and other work are still in their infancy.

Research and evaluation methods are available to improve our understanding of school safety approaches, including:

(1) Altering aspects of school buildings, staff, policies, procedures, and climate. He re-emphasized the importance of starting with schools and their environment for effective policy. Schools need to be changed before kids' values change.

(2) Providing alternative educational strategies including in-school programs, alternative-site programs for those dismissed, and juvenile justice systems programs. The public should work on education, skills, and knowledge applied safe dwellings and homes.

(3) Keeping weapons out of schools by having a person stand in the entrance monitoring the students who enter and frisking those who look suspicious. As an example, an old woman used as a monitor would be more effective than a beefy man or a metal detector providing its usual two-hour delay.

(3) Building relationships between school officials and law enforcement.

(4) Improving school information management systems.

(5) Targeting programs toward both the student body and students as individuals.

Mr. Kingery believed that there was no need to solve all the problems at once, as this is not the "American Way." The broad approach is a failed approach. There is need for sophisticated analysis and a need to disseminate information and perform cross-site studies. Data are being shared between researchers from the Hamilton Fish Institute, University of Maryland, SUNY-Albany, and the University of Hawaii in a meta-analysis structure to facilitate study and meta-analysis of multiple school violence prevention programs.

Results from the Byrne Evaluation Partnership Program

Moderator:
Michael Connelly, Director of Special Projects, Justice Research and Statistics Association, Washington, D.C.
Presenters:
C. Aaron McNeece, Professor of Social Work, Director, Institute for Health and Human Services Research, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, "Evaluation of the Administrative Components of Florida's Byrne Program"
Ronald K. Chordas, Director, Center for Human Services Development, Youngstown State University, Youngstown, Ohio, "Use of GIS Mapping to Determine Violent Crimes Task Force Impact on Violent Crime in the City of Youngstown, Ohio"
Daniel Jarosik, Research Specialist, Center on Education and Work, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, "An Evaluation Partnership Process and Product"

Aaron McNeece presented an evaluation of the administrative component of the Byrne Grant Program in Florida. The overall research design was a qualitative process evaluation using constant comparative analysis. The study included two groups of counties: a target group made up of counties that used a portion of their Byrne Program grants for administration and a comparison group made up of counties that did not use a grant-funded administrative component. The goal of the evaluation was to assess the perceived effectiveness of the administrative component subgrant in achieving positive changes with anti-drug activities. It was an exploratory study, seeking to understand and explain the function and role of Byrne administration in target and comparison counties.

The findings of the study showed several things about the decentralized administration. The findings were:

1. Larger counties and those with administrative components funded by the Byrne Program tended to be more bureaucratic than smaller counties and those without the administrative component funded by the Byrne Program;
2. In five of the eight counties the administration of the Byrne Program was associated with a human services function;
3. In Byrne Program-funded administrative components, personnel tended to have longer tenures than in non-Byrne Program funded counties;
4. In counties that had Byrne Program-funded administrators, the administrators had subgrantee monitoring responsibilities more often than in counties with non-Byrne Program-funded administrators;
5. Counties with the Byrne Program-funded administrative component conducted more meetings and monitoring visits with subgrantees than counties with non-Byrne Program-funded administrators;
6. Counties with Byrne Program-funded administrative components had higher levels of coordination, communication, collaboration, and cooperation among subgrantees than counties with non-Byrne Program funded administrators; and,
7. Stakeholders in counties with Byrne Program-funded administrative components perceived greater communication, efficiency and continuity and had no suggestions for improvement compared with stakeholders in counties with non-Byrne Program-funded administrative components.

In addition, according to Mr. McNeece, the initial stages of the cost-benefit analysis portion of the evaluation showed the program to be a financial success.

Daniel Jarosik discussed how a university-based research center joined with a state administrative agency in evaluating six local alcohol and other drug abuse programs in six county jails based in Madison, Wisconsin. He highlighted the planning for this process and the conducting of the evaluation and described some of the products of the evaluation. Mr. Jarosik used as examples both the project intake form and the project exit form to show how the programs were documented. Offenders gave a significant amount of personal information when he/she entered the program as well as their home county and whether they had participated in programs before. Upon exit, offenders recorded what programs they had participated in so Mr. Jarosik and his team could track re-arrests.

Ron Chordas spoke on the Mahonning Valley Law Enforcement Task Force, a multijurisdictional unit housed in the city of Youngstown composed of local and national law enforcement organizations. The task force is a county-wide unit combining local law enforcement with several federal agencies including the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Internal Revenue Service, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, and the U.S. Marshals Service. Among the barriers to implementation of the program were a history of noncooperation between the city and the county law enforcement agencies; overlapping jurisdictions; and disputes over ownership of crime scenes. Since the biggest problem with task forces such as these, according to Mr. Chordas, is who is in charge, the first task was to establish a coordinated effort. To remedy that, a centrally located board of control was established among the cooperating agencies.

GIS (geographical information systems) mapping was used extensively in Youngstown to try to locate criminal activity to use law enforcement resources better. Mr. Chordas demonstrated the technology of this mapping to show how to track and identify the concentration of violent activity, schedule concentrated patrols and raids in the concentrated areas, and measure their impact on crime within the targeted area. The maps that Chordas presented utilized GIS methodology to indicate the density of activity in various sections of the city. The maps were compared to calls for service and police reports of the Youngstown City Police Department within the selected areas. In Youngstown, with use of the GIS mapping, the task force was able to:
- identify criminal activity hot-spots and conduct city and county raids in those areas with resulting arrests, use of a special prosecutor, and convictions of violent offenders;
- conduct long term surveillance to identify violent offenders, dealers, and location of crack houses;
- use the pharmaceutical division to investigate illegal drug sales and use; and
- assist and train local police departments.

Research and Discussion Roundtables

Nancy O'Quinn, *Study Of the Administrative Component of the Byrne Program at the Local Level in Florida.*

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (ADAA-88) established the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program (Byrne Program). The purpose of the Byrne Program is to assist states in carrying out specific programs aimed at improving the functioning of the criminal justice system. To date, there have been three national assessments of the Byrne Program, but no previous evaluation specifically focused on the administration of Byrne funds. Florida is one of the few states that has decentralized the administration of Byrne Program funds. This study is a qualitative process evaluation that examines the administrative roles and processes of the local administration of the Byrne Program in Florida and describes those processes that facilitate the implementation of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988.

Goals of this evaluation were: (1) to assess the perceived effectiveness of the administrative component subgrant in advancing national drug control priorities in participating counties throughout Florida; (2) to investigate the administrative processes in place in a purposive sample of counties and to determine what differences having the Byrne-funded administrative component (subgrant) makes in the administration of the Byrne Program at the county level; (3) to examine local administrative structures and processes for their effects on the counties' abilities to improve interagency communication, cooperation, collaboration, and coordination of services; (4) to identify effective strategies implemented in these counties which provide information and consensus for the definition of drug problems; and (5) to identify the mix of programs in these counties that are providing services to eradicate the problems of substance abuse.

Findings indicate that the Byrne-funded administrative roles and processes and advisory board roles in the target counties were related to increased participation in program planning and decisionmaking by subgrantees and local citizenry, as compared to less participation in the comparison counties. Counties with the Byrne-funded administrative component had higher levels of coordination, communication, cooperation, and collaboration among subgrantees than counties without the Byrne-funded administrative position.

Ronald K. Chordas and Donald J. Petit, *Increasing Community Safety Through Collaborative Partnerships*

The focus of the presentation was to identify the advantages of the partnerships between federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies in the creation and coordination of a violent crime task force.

What are the benefits of creating a Violent Crime Task Force and what key components result in community-wide impact? The key ingredients of a successful collaborative effort between federal, state, and local officials were discussed. This roundtable presentation emphasized the importance of the linkages between state and local law enforcement organizations, the advantages of those linkages, and their impact on violent crime within the community.

Also discussed were the advantages of the linkages between the practitioners and the researcher, and between the state planning institution and the research organization. Finally, the issues to overcome, how best to overcome them within multijurisdictional units, and their community-wide impact were presented.

Pinky S. Wassenberg and Richard Schmitz, *Evaluation of the Homicide and Violent Crime Task Force in Madison and St. Clair Counties, Illinois*

Madison and St. Clair Counties in Illinois experienced high levels of violent crime in the last decade. In response, the Homicide and Violent Crime Strike Force was created to operate in these counties. (The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority funded both the task force and this evaluation.) The Task Force was a joint venture between the Illinois State Police and the Illinois Attorney General's Office to focus primarily on homicide and violent crime cases that were at least three years old. The goals were to select experienced homicide investigators with significant ties to the communities involved, to assist local prosecutors in the prosecution of task force cases, and occasionally to take a lead in the prosecution of cases.

The evaluation of the Task Force identified: (1) the original goals and objectives of the Task Force, its initial operating procedures, structure, and resources; (2) the evolution of the Task Force; and (3) the impact of the Task Force on cases, law enforcement, prosecutors, and the communities in which it operated.

The Task Force opened 72 cases, most involving murder charges. This impact was felt most strongly in St. Clair County (East St. Louis), the source of over 90% of their cases. The Task Force assisted local law enforcement by removing 72 cases from their caseloads and freed local police to use their limited resources on current cases. The Task Force also may have fostered an environment of positive competition wherein local law enforcement more aggressively pursued cases.

The Task Force assisted local prosecutors through the infusion of additional experienced personnel to develop homicide prosecutions. This increased the region's capacity to deal with homicide and violent crime. The success in prosecuting Task Force cases has made local officials more willing to pursue other old cases developed by the Task Force.

East St. Louis, the primary focus of Task Force operations, experienced a significant drop in its homicide rate during Task Force operations. In both Madison and St. Clair Counties, violent crime indicators were down for this same period. Attributing a precise impact on these rates to the Task

25

Force is not possible. However, the Task Force members and those working with them were convinced the Task Force and other anti-crime initiatives contributed to this decline.

G. Edward Wensuc, *Denver, Colorado, Drug Court*

The Denver Drug Court began operations in July 1994 and was developed as one response to address the issue of alcohol and drug abuse and its impact upon criminal activity. The proliferation of drug courts may, in part, be attributed to greater documented evidence on the efficacy of alcohol and drug treatment and the need to streamline court processes to best utilize scarce resources. Beginning in late 1997, the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) sought to determine the efficacy of the Denver Drug Court. Before an outcome evaluation was commissioned, DCJ thought it advisable to conduct a process evaluation to determine whether the Drug Court was operating as designed.

The process evaluation created profiles of drug offenders before and after the Denver Drug Court was established. These profiles assisted policy makers and programming professionals in determining whether the Denver Drug Court is accomplishing its original and evolving objectives. The findings from this report also assisted decision makers in identifying and prioritizing program interventions for Drug Court clientele. DCJ is expected to complete its outcome evaluation by late 1999.

Edward Cahoon Byrnes, *Utah's Third District Juvenile Drug Court*

The Third District Juvenile Drug Court Program (JDC) was designed as an alternative to the minimum mandatory penalties for first-time drug offenders in exchange for their participation in substance abuse education and/or rehabilitation. The Juvenile Drug Court is focused primarily on the "front end" population engaged in misdemeanor violations of drug laws (primarily marijuana) and second time possession of alcohol. According to Utah State law, what generally occurs as a result of such offenses is the "minimum mandatory penalties," including at least a $150 fine, 20 to 100 hours of community service, and suspension of the driver's license. However, these penalties do not force juvenile offenders and their families to address the youth's substance abuse problems. The JDC can provide a mechanism to address the substance abuse problem through education and treatment, family intervention, community protection, and appropriate sanctions and consequences. The combination of these factors results in a balanced approach to the issue of youth substance use.

The JDC provides an expedited court process, and cases are set for judicial reviews at 30-45 day intervals to monitor participants' progress. Reviews may occur as often as every week for those who break the JDC's conditions or continually have problems. At each review, a youth's accomplishments over the past weeks are summarized. Depending on their progress, clients may be congratulated, admonished, or may receive additional penalties for noncompliance. Additional

penalties may include, but are not limited to, assessment of additional community service hours, month by month extension in the program, or short-term commitment to a detention facility.

The mission of the JDC was to (1) identify youth with substance abuse issues and to provide them with appropriate resources, and (2) divert them from further substance use and court involvement. Services were available in the following areas: (1) substance abuse evaluation utilizing substance abuse survey instrument, (2) referral to a variety of community-based education programs (at cost to family), (3) referral to substance abuse treatment programs, if necessary, (4) referral to mental health agencies, if necessary, (5) random urine drug screens at no cost to family, (6) tracking services (home, work, school, community), (7) collaboration with other agencies in contact with families, and (8) regularly scheduled judicial reviews to insure participant compliance.

Targeted cases were identified upon receipt at the Juvenile Court. Cases were set for an initial interview within two weeks of receipt, at which time they were subject to a substance abuse evaluation utilizing the SASSI, as well as a social and substance use history. Potential participants who either denied the allegation(s) or refused to participate in the process were removed from further consideration of participation in the program. If a minor appeared appropriate and chose to participate in the JDC, the case was scheduled for a court hearing within two to four weeks, at which time a plea in abeyance was entered for a minimum of six months.

Each JDC participant was ordered to complete a minimum of 60 hours of community service, and they were expected to complete at least 15 of these hours per month. Other conditions of participation included enrollment in either a family-focused substance abuse education program or a substance abuse treatment program within one month of the first court hearing. Participants also had to write a research paper, an essay, and a book report during three weeks in the JDC. These writing assignments were meant to shift the youths' perspective and compel them to utilize critical thinking and cognitively look at drug and alcohol issues.

Depending on the outcome of the substance abuse evaluation, a referral was made to either a community-based education program or to a treatment agency. Those determined by the substance abuse survey instrument to be chemically nondependent were referred to educational programs, which included parents and youth. They met in group sessions two hours each week, for six weeks. Topics of discussion included, but were not limited to: Communication, Family Relationships, Drug Awareness and Education, Decision Making, Refusal Skills, Accountability, Problem Solving, Feelings, Denial, and Laws and Consequences. Once a participant completed the educational program, the agency sent confirmation to the court, and the youth was given hour-for-hour credit toward their community service.

Participants who were determined by the substance abuse survey instrument to be chemically dependent were referred to substance abuse treatment, which was left to professionals in the field. Because a state agency could not make specific referrals to private organizations, participants were given a list of treatment agencies in the community. They were given the responsibility of choosing the agency that best suited their needs, but had to follow the treatment recommendations of a licensed professional (i.e., inpatient, outpatient, day treatment, etc.). Participants were required to bring proof of enrollment to court within four weeks, and compliance with treatment plans was

monitored. Counseling had to be continued until the client was clinically discharged from the program. Participants were eligible to receive hour-for-hour credit toward community service for counseling.

Tracking services and random drug testing also began within seven days of the first JDC hearing. These services included monitoring participants' progress at home, at school, on the job, and in the community. Drug testing occurred at least once per month, but generally more often, depending on the individual in question.

Other requirements of the JDC included school attendance, which is monitored, and parental support and involvement, which were critical to a youth's success in the program. Youths also had to refrain from any law violations and referrals to the court. Another requirement for JDC participants was attendance at semimonthly speaking engagements. Each month, the JDC arranged these two-hour meetings with professionals in the field of substance abuse and law enforcement, or those who were willing to speak about their personal experiences relating to drugs or alcohol. These activities were designed to further educate the clients and families on drug and alcohol issues.

Any breach of the JDC conditions could result in a participant's plea being entered, or, in other words, the juvenile record would contain admission to the allegation and the resulting conviction. A participant successfully completed the JDC after compliance with the established conditions had been determined, and he/she had remained substance free, usually a six-month period of time. A graduation ceremony was held in conjunction with the Speakers Bureau each month, to celebrate the success of JDC graduates.

Paul Stageberg, *Polk County (Iowa) Drug Court: From an Evaluator's Perspective*

Polk County, Iowa (Des Moines), established a drug court in 1996, and the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Planning (CJJP) obtained a contract during the following year to evaluate the program. Both of these might be referred to as "second generation," as Polk County, in designing its drug court, had the opportunity to draw upon the experience of many other drug courts. Similarly, in preparing an evaluation design, CJJP has had the opportunity to draw upon a number of previous drug court evaluations.

The uniqueness of the Polk County Drug Court was supposed to have been its concentration on probation violators who instead of being revoked to prison, were referred to the drug court. Now in its third year, the project has been able to continue its focus on those scheduled for probation revocation, looking for evidence that the original concept been modified. Polk County, in the heart of the upper mid-west, also lies in methamphetamine country. The prevalence of this drug in the county also leads to the question, do addicts present special problems for drug courts?

This presentation involved a description of the Polk County Drug Court, its development,

organization, and operation. Given the nature of the original target group, it examined what difficulties the program faced? Did the "hard core" nature of the target group present any social problems? Would outcomes in the Polk County project have been any different than outcomes in drug courts with more standard target groups (e.g., those charged with drug possession)?

The evaluation of the Polk County project attempted to capitalize on the experience of past drug court evaluations. The presentation also described the design of the project evaluation and some of the special attributes of drug courts that may lead to unusual approaches in evaluation. Obstacles to the evaluation were discussed, as well as how the evaluation could improve on previous drug evaluations and what recommendations the evaluators had for others involved in drug court evaluations.

Marvene O'Rourke, *International Center Programs*

As the world grows smaller, crime has become increasingly transnational in nature, showing no respect for national borders. The types of crime crossing international boundaries vary widely, ranging from transport of drugs from a producing or processing country to a market oceans away, to the smuggling of humans from one continent to another for illicit purposes. International crime is creative and employs cutting edge technology exemplified by the explosion of electronic crime around the globe.

At this topic table, International Center staff were available to discuss how transnational crime impacts every corner of the United States and to discuss the activities and programs NIJ has developed in response to transnational crime. The objective of these efforts was to

- Disseminate criminal justice information worldwide
- Connect researchers and practitioners around the world
- Create global research partnerships
- Build informational technology infrastructures
- Expand information exchange on crime and justice.

NIJ international programs included I-ADAM, International Challenge Grants, Ukraine Research Partnership, Visitor Program, International Visiting Fellowships, International Document Exchange, and a variety of partnerships with other countries.

Eric S. Jefferis, *Crime Mapping Research Center*

Established in 1997, the goals of the NIJ Crime Mapping Research Center (CMRC) are the promotion, research, evaluation, development, and dissemination of GIS (geographic information

systems) technology and the spatial analysis of crime. CMRC staff were on hand to discuss current activities, crime mapping research grant opportunities, and visiting fellowships.

Suzanne McMurphy, *MAPS: An Instrumentation System for Clinical and Research Utilization*

The Monitoring Area and Phase System (MAPS) presents a model of instrumentation based upon specific client problem fields (area) and client stages of change (phase), as well as conditions of treatment, i.e., staff competence, program resources, program treatment and goals, and interventions related to clients' needs and stages of change. The uniqueness of this instrument system is its multiple levels of use from individual client baseline scoring, treatment planning and client matching, to program monitoring and evaluating program effectiveness. The conceptualization of the MAPS is based upon the Addiction Severity Index (ASI) and the Stages of Change theory developed by Prochaska and DiClemente. The combination of the ASI and the theory on stages of change have been used previously for substance abuse treatment and assessment, but this is the first battery of instruments to standardize these two approaches into an integrated model which includes macro program components as well as individual client data.

The MAPS was developed to meet both clinical and research needs for a collaborative project between clinicians and researchers in ten European countries. The Swedish Department of Corrections has recently adopted the MAPS for both individual clinical assessment and program evaluation across the correctional system in Sweden. The MAPS is being implemented in the United States for the first time through a comprehensive process and outcome evaluation of substance abuse treatment programs within the New Hampshire Department of Corrections. This scientific roundtable described the use of the MAPS system for clinical and research purposes and well as described how it could be used as a system of program evaluation within correctional settings.

David Castro, *Mobilizing Local Government and Organizing Citizens to Combat Nuisance Properties' Drug Markets*

This session included a discussion of the " Philadelphia" approach (multiagency with focus on citizen action) and offered an opportunity to strategize about the specific local challenges other communities are confronting.

Roger Conner, *Getting Lawyers to Be Problem Solvers: Police Legal Advisor, Prosecutor, City Attorney, and Pro Bono Attorney, and Now Community Oriented Lawyering?*

A small but growing group of lawyers in the United States are shedding their traditional roles as case processors and taking a direct working interest in the problems of particular communities, families, and offenders. Not surprisingly, this group includes prosecutors, city attorneys, police legal advisors, and judges. But legal aid lawyers, nonprofit and pro bono lawyers, law school students, and criminal defense lawyers are also finding ways to fulfill their ethical obligations to their clients and produce outcomes that improve the safety and health of neighborhoods. This roundtable discussed the characteristics of this group, research questions that need to be answered, and how police departments can encourage the lawyers they deal with to become more effective problem solving partners.

Jane Moore and Ruth Budelmann, *Massachusetts Flashpoint: Life Skills Through the Lens of Media Literacy–Evaluating an Innovative Intervention*

This discussion provided information on the development, implementation, and evaluation of *Flashpoint: Life Skills Through the Lens of Media Literacy*, a program produced by Essex County (Massachusetts) District Attorney Burke's office, as an intervention for high-risk youth. *Flashpoint* is a 12-session educational, group-based program designed to teach basic elements of media literacy and apply that learning in thinking critically about violence, substance abuse, and prejudice. By combining media literacy and critical thinking skills, participants:

- Discern overt and subtle effects and messages of media presentations;
- Analyze both form and content of media presentations; and
- Resist influences that would promote violence, substance abuse, or prejudice.

Research provides evidence of the tremendous influence media exerts on the lives of youth. Young people themselves report that media is *the* most significant influence in their lives, often greater than family or friends. While they are important sources of information, education and entertainment, media often portray risky and even criminal behavior in glamorous ways, with few, if any, consequences. Adolescents who are vulnerable to lures of risk-taking or criminal behavior are exposed to these media presentations for many hours each week, but without skills to critically analyze or deconstruct messages.

Flashpoint was developed to provide these youth with the necessary critical thinking and literacy skills to analyze what they see and hear in the media, and, equally important, to apply these skills to making more informed choices in their own lives, particularly on issues of violence, substance

31

abuse and prejudice. *Flashpoint* provides youth with skills and strategies for "cooling down" and making wiser choices during stressful moments, or "flashpoints."

The program has been pilot tested with three juvenile justice populations: youth in diversion programs, youth on probation, and youth in custody of the Department of Youth Services. Qualitative evaluation of the pilot test has been completed, and construction of a valid, reliable pre-post evaluation measure is in process.

The panel reported on the conceptual basis of *Flashpoint* and findings of the pilot test and qualitative evaluation, as well as the challenges of evaluating a nontraditional, media-based intervention. Background material was provided.

Tammy Meredith, *Assessing Sexual Assault Victim Services Programs*

Very little is known in Georgia about the availability, quality, and delivery of victim services to victims of sexual assault. This roundtable will address issues arising during the course of a year-long study funded by the Georgia Statistical Analysis Center. The purpose of the study is to (a) provide state-level policymakers with critical information for funding and grant program planning for sexual assault-related services, and (b) to improve services to victims of sexual assault in Georgia.

The study focused on two populations–those providing sexual assault victim services and those requesting sexual assault victim services. Four groups were surveyed: Victim Witness Assistant Program (VWAP) personnel in all 46 judicial circuits in Georgia, a sample of victims requesting services at VWAPs, Rape Crisis Center personnel in all 24 centers in Georgia, and a sample of victims requesting services at the centers. The final report will recommend strategies for improving program service availability, accessibility, and quality; identify personnel training needs; identify gaps in victim services statewide; and recommend strategies for public education campaigns to encourage victims to report sexual assaults to law enforcement.

The Project Manager, Dr. Meredith, discussed her difficulties encountered in gaining entrée to programs, how relying upon program staff improved the survey questionnaire design process, the implications of decisions regarding the distribution of questionnaires, the pros and cons of scannable surveys, managing the conflicting goals of state funders and program staff, and what she learned about improving evaluation research from the process.

Mark Myrent and Phillip Stevenson, *Evaluation of the Cook County State's Attorney's Victim-Witness Program*

This impact evaluation assessed whether the program provided the services that felony crime victims need, whether it reached the people it sought to serve, and whether the services provided were effective in meeting the material and psychological needs of its clients. This part of the study relied primarily on a survey of adult felony victims whose cases were filed in court during 1995 through 1997, and who had varying degrees of participation in the program. The comprehensive evaluation methodology in general, as well as the victim survey and other data collection instruments specifically, were developed as models for project replication in other jurisdictions.

Haiou He, *Peer Court Evaluation*

Peer Court as a dispositional alternative for first-time offenders has been in existence for over 20 years. However, until recently, there has been very little research-based information on the effectiveness of peer courts. This roundtable presented the evaluation results of the McMinnville Community Peer Court, one of Oregon's 18 juvenile violence prevention programs funded by the Edward Byrne Memorial Fund. The focus of this roundtable will be to describe: (1) McMinnville Community Peer Court and its implementation, (2) characteristics that distinguish peer court program completers from noncompleters, (3) factors associated with reoffense among peer court youth, and (4) the length of time to reoffense for peer court youth vs. non-peer court youth. Participants were encouraged to share their experiences in the implementation and evaluation of peer courts.

Cheri Crawford and Lois Mock, *Practitioner Visiting Fellows*

Participants in this roundtable discussion were encouraged to provide NIJ staff with ideas and suggestions on meaningful ways to structure its visiting fellowship program for practitioners working in the criminal justice and related fields.

Workshops

Frugal Evaluation for Justice Policy Decisions

Presenters:
Roger K. Przybylski, Consultant, Kent Consulting Group, Evanston, Illinois
Michael G. Maxfield, Professor and Associate Dean, School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers University, Newark, New Jersey

Maxfield and Przbylski discussed how to conduct meaningful evaluations with limited resources. Przbylski began by stating that while he saw value in and used traditional evaluation methods, he was also critical of the way evaluation has been done in the past. Therefore, he wanted to call attention to alternatives. He saw a difference between what students are taught in grad school and what the real world demands regarding evaluation.

Policy makers and practitioners have different needs than academics, according to Mr. Przybylski. Program evaluators are not always writing to be published in a journal, as are academics; sometimes evaluation work must be more straightforward, with readily useable information. The work of an evaluator must be practical. In the theoretical academic world, the search is for the ultimate truth. But when legislation is involved, compromises must be made. Policymakers may try to base their decisions on scientific fact, but they also must be democratic; often those two forces create a paradox. Good research raises more questions than answers, and evaluators must know that there is no one unequivocal answer. In a policy environment, their work must reflect constituent interests and assumptions, in Mr. Przybylski's view.

Mr. Przybylski outlined five established components of evaluation theory valued in the traditional perspective of evaluation: the social programming component, the knowledge component, the value component, the use component, and the practice component. The social programming component emphasizes the rational model, including logical statements such as, "If we can identify which programs work, policymakers will eliminate ineffective interventions and replace them with better ones." Expectations, such as an organization's goals, are explicitly agreed upon and the cause and effect relationship between organizational activities and goal achievement must be understood.

Many evaluators hold fast to tenets of the knowledge component that say science is the best way to discover objective truth and that internal validity is the hallmark characteristic of good research. Traditional ideals under the value component say that evaluation can and should be value-free, or, if values are prescriptively selected, those particular values or definitions of success are promoted, and an evaluator can tell if a program is successful or valuable.

Evaluators are taught under the use component that findings are worth using only if they have withstood the most rigorous scientific tests, that good findings are compelling, and evaluators' work should be published in refereed journals, letting the chips fall where they may. Traditional lessons of the practice component say that evaluators should be free to pursue knowledge as well as being responsible to scientific peers. Evaluators under the practice component have been told that their

central task is summing up treatment effects, that cause and effect is the key question, and that randomized experiments provide the best answers.

Mr. Przbylkski then presented a different notion of what evaluation should be. He asserted that a highly critical look should be taken at these traditional methods and ideals of evaluation and that there is room and need for alternatives. Decisions are made on a more complex basis than provided by the rational model. He offered the following critiques of each of the components of evaluation theory previously outlined:

> (1) the social programming component: using a rational model for decisions will distort conclusions; irrational decisionmaking is healthy; stakeholders, political considerations and organizational characteristics interact to complicate each problem-solving activity; evaluation is a political act in which power, ideology, and interests are paramount; programs rarely make large changes.

> (2) the knowledge component: popularization denies evaluators of their privileged position in constructing knowledge; stakeholders should control what counts as knowledge in political and social decisions; practice is guided by personal experiences; external validity is the *sine qua non* of good research; it is pointless to draw causal conclusions; the field's central task is to generate knowledge that transfers to heterogeneous local projects where services are or might be delivered.

> (3) the value component: all truths and solutions are in the minds of all participants of the program for it has no single true value; the evaluator needs opinions from his audiences to do a responsive evaluation; evaluation can play the role of expert witness in any political system, with a jury of decisionmakers and stakeholders who reach a verdict based on program effectiveness; evaluators should use descriptive valuing as the basis for determining worth of programs.

> (4) the use component: an organizational development role must be assumed in order to facilitate instrumental use of evaluations; knowledge of diverse matters (e.g., program context and implementation) is more useful and generalizable than causal relationships; responsive evaluation enables readers to develop tactical knowledge without experiencing the program directly; sources for disseminating knowledge can also include reports aimed at scholars and practitioners, ad hoc media presentations, and informal conversations; describing effects and impacts at the program level provides little leverage for short-term instrumental use.

> (5) the practice component: the purpose of evaluation differs from that of social research; the evaluator must be practical and a proponent of rigor, with the best design being one that encompasses net effects; evaluations can be "good enough" for answering policy and program questions; the evaluator needs to be interested in helping to improve efficiencies and achieving success; benefitting all is the primary goal; with this is the need to ask many types of questions.

Mr. Przbylkski said that there must be a commitment to evaluation that starts with good management. Evaluation cannot be done in a vacuum; it is an ongoing process that guides program development. Objectivity must be pursued but not in isolation of other factors in the policy environment. Stakeholder involvement is crucial. Collaboration between the researcher, practitioner, funding body, and policymakers should exist from the beginning, framing research questions,

defining measures and success, and providing frequent feedback. Evaluation must consist of a continuum of activities, from needs assessment to logic analysis to process evaluation to impact evaluation. Mr. Przbylkski asserted that some level of evaluation can be accomplished, regardless of resources. The evaluator's role includes training stakeholders to evaluate themselves. Self-evaluation is an economical and ideal solution to evaluation despite resource limitations.

Michael G. Maxfield discussed "scientific realism" as a frugal approach to evaluation. He emphasized four characteristics of frugal evaluation: (1) it is purposive and theory-driven and uses street-level knowledge; (2) it is analytic, and data collection is consistent with the purpose in a logical way; (3) it is empirical, synonymous to experience, and not always quantifiable; and (4)it is problem-focused, the element that pulls the purposive, analytical, and empirical characteristics together.

Some basic principles of "scientific realism" in frugal evaluation are : (1) adjusted expectation, looking for impact where it is reasonably expected, e.g. , small areas, specific offenses, specific circumstances; (2) understanding substitutes for controls, as used in natural sciences, enhancing internal validity; (3) aggregated results from similar small-scale studies for more control and enhancing external validity.

Mr. Maxfield asserted that understanding mechanisms in context is important to frugal evaluation and has two key strands. First, observed regularity equals mechanism plus context. For example, intervention to prevent repeat domestic violence victimization may increase initial reports, while reducing reports of repeat victimization, as victims are usually repeat victims, especially in domestic violence cases. Second, sorting intervention targets into more homogeneous groups that will be more sensitive to particular actions improves later understanding of program impact. For example, targeting telephone toll fraud instead of fraud in general will prevent dispersion of program impact across contexts less suited for the efforts to reduce or eliminate telephone toll fraud.

Mr. Maxfield offered suggestions for conducting specifically directed evaluation: think in advance of the expected impact; formulate a theory of action (or logic model) connecting the action to the impact; select interventions that can expect to be effective, evaluate and revise as needed, and collaborate between evaluators and practitioners. Negative results may occur because of theory, implementation, or measurement failures. The general lessons of this approach are that (1) people with detailed knowledge of the problem should be the ones tailoring evaluation to a specific application; (2) focus should be on specific elements of the problem and what appears to be a reasonable approach to addressing it; (3) the one-size-fits-all approach to programs and their evaluation should be avoided; and (4) frugal evaluation is different from developing a common evaluation model with common measures to apply equally in all areas.

In Mr. Maxfield's view, frugal evaluation involves asking fundamental, action/intervention, and evaluation questions such as: Did you get what you expected? What are you going to do to get that? What measures will be made? Compared to what? To develop resources and the practice of frugal evaluation, he suggested that partnerships be made between organizations such as OJP and university policy or criminal justice programs through internships or "adopting" policy evaluation classes. He

also recommended front- and back-end consulting and use of evaluation audit teams as means to keep evaluation costs down.

Mr. Maxfield concluded with the following recommendations: (1) study small things in context and let results accumulate to a general experience, replicating the problem-solving process; (2) acknowledge the nature of situational crime prevention; (3) investigate the elements underlying repeat victimization as a means of crime prevention; and (4) create a synthesis of common elements of successful interventions.

Collection, Assessment, and Utilization of Program Evaluation Results

Presenters:
Jerry M. Hatfield, Assistant Professor of Human Services, Co-Director, Center for the Study of Interpersonal Violence, Community College of Rhode Island, Warwick, Rhode Island
Robert Kirchner, Senior Advisor for Evaluation, Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Robert Kirchner stated that BJA is trying to build capacities at the state and local levels and has sponsored a group of publications–guidelines, evaluation handbooks, and performance indicators--about innovative and effective programs. Originally there was a goal to find an evaluation strategy to apply nationwide to similar programs, but he said evaluators have discovered that there is no such thing. Some states are extremely diverse from region to region. Programs differ, and so must the evaluation strategies. There are alternative goals for each program because there are different states and different ways to do things and different funding sources. Each program has needs particular to its individual state even when states pursue similar programs set by themselves or the federal government.

A complete evaluation system comprises seven parts: (1) the nature and extent of the current situation (individual, group, specific location), (2) a program effectiveness model (who, what, how, under what condition), (3) performance indicators,(4) program analysis (expected results compared to actual), (5) outcome indicators, (6) a program impact model (when, where, why), and (7) confirmation criteria. All of the pieces must be present to perform a successful evaluation. There is almost always more than one type of indicator and one type of output. Success is not defined strictly by meeting final goals; there are accomplishments along the way to implementation.

Completion of all three phases of evaluation is a must. The first is a "Program of Logic Analysis" that is to be completed with all stakeholders. The next step is a "Process Evaluation," then followed by an "Impact (or Intensive) Evaluation." Key to the successful evaluation is getting agreement among the stakeholders on the elements of the process, building understanding and support for all three phases listed.

In 1989, Oregon took a new approach to determining outcomes, unveiling "Oregon Benchmarks." The benchmarks established priorities to assess Oregon's progress toward broad goals, including those in public safety. Progress toward achieving the goals on a statewide level is updated every two years in presentations to the state legislature; partial review is done annually.

Part of the reason for successful implementation in Oregon was an explicit tie between program managers at the local level and policy makers in the state government. Also, the benchmarks identified the actual program strategies put in place and looked at the availability and accessibility of data resources statewide. In anticipation of long-term evaluation, the participants agreed on the outcomes to be examined and on what the program would *not* be expected to do.

The more aggregated the targets, the less meaningful they are, according to Mr. Kirchner; the less aggregated they are, the more meaningful their data are. Each program must have its own logic model, linking goals and objectives to program actions. From the start of the project, individual indicators must be set. Oregon found that a good way to manage statewide programs was to know exactly what was happening. Among the factors linked to the success of a program was using a timeline mechanism to show each of the program steps. All programs must be monitored, some going forward to process evaluation, and a select group undergoing impact evaluation. Another factor linked to success was the increased ability to enhance justification of the program for funding, survival, or other needs. Federal assistance is to get programs started, but state and local assistance is needed to sustain programs. Program development required more than "one shot assessment." Longitudinal studies and alternative approaches must also be used and are easier to perform now in Oregon with the data provided by its "benchmarks."

Jerry Hatfield stated that evaluators want to believe that people will take notice of evaluation results and that they will be utilized, but that is not always the case. Politics drives which programs are enacted. Different parties feel a rivalry against one another, causing tension between practitioners, researchers, and policymakers. All of the parties involved have some sort of common ground, though; no one group of stakeholders can "own" the turf.

As Mr. Hatfield noted, program people want to "do it now" to see the results. They have little patience because they are short-term action people. Their attitude is that the people must/will prevail. Researchers want to "think about it" and have a moderate level of patience. They think science will/must prevail. Finally, policymakers see things in the scope of large-scale change. They are long-term, planning people who believe that compromise will prevail. Mr. Hatfield stated that it is not necessary to abandon one's value system to understand and consider others. He said, however, that it is important to maintain and modify one's value system.

Mr. Hatfield described the "Value Convergence" model to illustrate. The key principles of the model are:
> 1. All elements of the system are interdependent. Each unit (program, research, policy) must exist to keep the system in balance. If evaluators respect the ideas of systems balance, then they will respect each element of the system. There is a "natural order" to all systems.
> 2. If one element were to be eliminated, then the system would be out of balance.

3. "Conflict" is not unhealthy, but rather should be seen as healthy "tension" that keeps the system in balance.

4. It is not necessary to abandon one's value system to understand and consider others. In fact, it is important to maintain and modify one's value system.

5. Any effort that fails to work toward convergence will further splinter the efforts and increase the system's dysfunction and divergence. It's not nice to fool with Mother Nature by eliminating elements (species) in the system. Evaluators who do "fool" will pay.

Mr. Hatfield then provided a scenario detailing the model in action. Prior to implementing a batterers' education program at the Community College of Rhode Island, numerous levels and offices within the college's administrative structure were identified as being critical decisionmakers. They were consulted prior to asking for final approval by the President's council which is the final authority and decisionmaking body for the college. The questions they were asked were:

1. Does the program interfere with any existing programs and/or systems?

2. Does it establish any new precedents?

3. Does it increase anyone's management responsibilities?

4. Will it drain existing systems for support, such as budgeting, accounting, personnel, or maintenance?

5. Will it attract any media attention? Is that good or bad?

6. Will it affect the sponsoring agency's cash flow?

7. Will we have to pay for it in the future?

Mr. Hatfield then asked, whose responsibility is it to make recommendations as a result of an evaluation? He said that fundamentally the responsibility is the evaluator's, but evaluators can follow a checklist of actions to ensure that the evaluator/stakeholder interaction is respected and maintained. Specifically, he advised that:

1. Policymakers' and managers' interests must be understood and respected.

2. Evaluation design must address the concerns of policymakers and managers from the beginning of the program.

3. Most, if not all, of the program's goals must be supported by policy makers and managers.

4. Evaluators must be involved in the planning stages of the program.

5. Evaluation must not be a one-time effort, but rather should be an ongoing process.

6. Continuous communication must emanate from the program.

7. "Recommendations" are not necessarily beneficial in an evaluation. Options and alternative pathways may be better.

Evaluating Treatment Services Components of Criminal Justice Programs

Presenters:
Kenneth D. Robinson, President, Correctional Counseling, Inc., Memphis, Tennessee
Peter J. Delany, Deputy Chief, Services Research Branch, Division of Clinical and Services Research, National Institute on Drug Abuse, Bethesda, Maryland

Mr. Robinson began by stating that drugs and criminal activity have increased 239% since 1980. In 1975, therapeutic communities were developed to treat the influx in people with narcotics problems. Therapeutic communities were successful, but their post-contact interviews used for evaluations provided only "snapshots" of data.

Mr. Robinson, in his search for a fuller picture, was familiar with cognitive behavioral literature and realized that cognitive behavior models do work. He put in place a program for offenders already incarcerated. The models he used proved effective for both juveniles and adults. In order to be effective, the programs needed to be run by specifically trained staff, to have structured follow-ups, and to address the unique needs of the criminal and the way that he/she thinks. After-care was also vital to the success of the program. Non-dynamic punishment implemented by untrained counselors do not work, in Mr. Robinson's view.

According to Mr. Robinson, cognitive models of treatment are based on a few fundamental principles:
1. Maintain frequency of behavior learning principles
2. Change the way the client thinks and acts
3. Relate to client's difficulties and problems
4. Provide systematic treatment
5. Provide short-term periods of treatment
6. Provide a blend of active client exercises, homework, tasks, and active skills development
7. Conduct outcome research

The client must learn how to distinguish right from wrong, according to Mr. Robinson. Cognitive Behavior Therapy is more than telling the client what to do; it is also explaining why they should do it. Lawrence Kohlberg believed that there were three levels on which people make decisions: pleasure vs. pain, deal making, and approval. Criminals tend to function at the deal-making level.

Moral Reconation Therapy (MRT), developed by Mr. Robinson, is a process to redefine willful, conscious decisionmaking processes. It is set up in a workbook fashion with structured exercises. MRT focuses systematically on seven basic treatment issues: confrontation of beliefs, attitudes and behaviors; assessment of current relationships; reinforcement of positive behavior and habits; positive identity formation; enhancement of self-concept; decrease in hedonism and development of frustration tolerance; and development of higher stages of moral reasoning.

40

MRT was used first with DWI offenders, and the initial stages of research showed that the program was highly successful. But when the 10-year data were examined, it showed that the program actually had no effect on the rearrest rate for DWI offenses. The participants did, however, show a dramatic reduction of rearrests for other offenses. MRT seemed to reduce the criminality of the participant. The short-term data were supportive, but the long-term data also showed that a reduction in the reincarceration/rearrest rate occurred after treatment.

Peter Delany stated that there must be accountability on all sides of treatment—from the clinician, the patient, and the program. According to Mr. Delany, people are in the habit of sticking to a practice, even if it is not successful. Programs must adjust and go through incremental changes. The goals and objectives of a program must be met in a productive fashion.

In Mr. Delany's view, the public must rethink its traditional ideas about treatment in the criminal justice system. A pattern of repeated exposure, from being in and out of the system, may not be a failure; the public must examine what is accomplished for the money that is spent on treatment services.

Mr. Delany stated that, in evaluating the success of a program, evaluators should not use dichotomous variables. Programs can work on many different levels and they can find success in incremental values. Evaluators must look for victories on all levels.

Determining Effective State and Local Programs: A New Evaluation Framework

Presenters:
Gregory Robinson, Director, Social Science Research Center, California State University-Fullerton, Fullerton, California
Douglas Young, Senior Research Associate, Vera Institute of Justice, New York, New York

Douglas Young described a new evaluation framework emphasizing early evaluator involvement in program planning. He discussed nine key steps of program development and implementation which were of special concern under this new framework:
- Under Identifying the problem--(1) Identify program goals and objectives; (2) State the theories that underlie the intervention; (3) Implement program monitoring; measure program outputs;
- Under Assessing program integrity (Process Evaluation)--(4) Describe, assess process of program implementation; identify barriers to implementation; (5) Describe program as implemented and compare with original plan & design; test logic model; (6) Identify and measure performance indicators; (7) Identify intermediate and long-term outcomes and measures; and

- Under Assessing program outcomes (Impact Evaluation)--(8) Develop and implement research design; test program impact, effectiveness; and (9) Inform stakeholders about findings; identify and implement recommendations; disseminate findings to wider audience.

He then described application of the framework to evaluation of the La Bodega de la Familia demonstration project begun by the Vera Institute in New York City. He started with identifying the program, explaining that the program works with families of substance abuse victims and provides services to these families. It is intended to build support around the individual by supporting the family. The goal of the program is to reduce the risk of a family having a member involved in substance abuse and to help the abuser recover and become an out-patient. According to Mr. Young, it was especially difficult to retain patients, especially with out-patients, in the program and to get a lasting impression. They received benefits from support systems in the community and in the family, but were confronted with problems such as a high dropout rate and too costly residential programs.

Other problems found in the La Bodega project included:
(1) The criminal justice system did not define the drug problem as a health problem. The response to relapse was to use punitive criminal justice sanctions.
(2) Criminal justice agents were not focused on family/social contacts.
(3) Families victimized or at-risk by having a substance abuser involved in the criminal justice system can be put at risk by the system incarcerating the offender, especially bread-winners.

According to Mr. Young, regarding the process evaluation stage, in action research and formative or process evaluation, evaluators need to observe activities and determine their effects to feedback to the program. La Bodega had frequent meetings with their criminal justice agencies and referral groups in order to get feedback. Regarding outcome evaluation and measures, in La Bodega, Mr. Young identified a set of measures concerning the family, the individual (substance abuser), an adult member (nonabuser), and children measures. In Mr. Young's view, it is important to standardize the measures. In process evaluations, the director has the goal to change the way criminal justice agencies (parole, courts, etc.) deal with individuals and to think of families and drugs and not simply with punitive means.

Gregory Robinson stated that all program activities need to be monitored for accountability purposes. Process evaluations provide descriptions and measurements, and should be reached by the second year of a project. Good impact evaluation can be very expensive, more so than process evaluation. Therefore, only evaluators producing good process evaluations should be chosen to conduct impact evaluations.

According to Mr. Robinson, it is often said that evaluation is a linear process, but, in his view it is actually a cyclic process. The beginning comes around to the end. The program directors need to be given feedback and the evaluation needs to be utilized. Evaluation needs to be useful to program managers. Mr. Robinson stated that there are three criteria to identify goals and objectives: (1) Define goals and objectives for the evaluation program; (2) Create explicit links between project

outcomes; and (3) Obtain suitable outcomes for programs. A goal is a broad, ambitious statement. Objectives can be broken down into process objectives and outcome objectives. Process objectives are the project activities and the plan of action. Outcome objectives are the real changes in lives and circumstances in the person or environment. Goals and objectives often change in the life of the project.

The theory of change is the framework. Evaluators need to make some practical assumptions, such as having the services be accessible by public transportation. In the project activity, planners and evaluators need to determine what to do to lead to the outcome, and determine causes by an if-then statement They also need to acknowledge the field experiment and theory, and articulate competing theories in the outcomes.

Mr. Robinson recommended working with project staff to identify appropriate outcomes. It is also necessary to leave room for flexibility for unintended outcomes so the evaluator can link the outcomes to the indicators. Although ideal indicators are observable and measurable, it is better, in Mr. Robinson's view, to single out multiple indicators to triangulate them. Many outcomes are abstract and not concrete enough to be measured directly.

Mr. Robinson illustrated the process of moving from outcomes to indicators to measurement. In linking outcomes with indicators, he said that: (1) Indicators refer to observable, measurable phenomenon; (2) as a rule, multiple indicators are preferable to single indicators; (3) evaluators should match the "level of analysis" between the service target and the indicator; (4) evaluators should select indicators that are sensitive to change; (5) knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs may represent progress toward an outcome, but by themselves are not compelling indicators; (6) standardized measures provide comparability across programs and usually have acceptable reliability and validity; and (7) the measurement of simple behavior, as well as technical instruments, can serve as indicators.

Sources of data for these evaluations include: (1) persons; (2) observer ratings; and (3) archival data/ program records. Data types used could be: (1) quantitative and (2) qualitative. Data collection methods included: (1) self-administered questionnaires; (2) mailed questionnaires or surveys; (3) face-to-face administration; (4) telephone interviewing; and (5) observation. Indicator "usability" criteria required attention of evaluators to: (1) availability in primary language of program participants; (2) literacy levels; (3) appropriate to developmental or conceptual level of the respondent; (4) culturally appropriate; and (5) appropriate consent procedures– rights of human subjects–since participation is voluntary.

Finally, Mr. Robinson discussed tools for articulating a project's "program logic" or "theory of change" framework. Inputs/resources are new and/or existing conditions and resources available to conduct specific activities (e.g., people, funds, physical plant, reputation, networking skills). Practical assumptions about the programs concern the microscopic steps comprising the project activity, which is an action, duty, or treatment performed to achieve immediate outcomes. The causal assumptions/ theory of change is the rationale underlying the project design. The immediate

outcomes are the results directly from an activity, leading to shorter term outcomes, which are behaviors or other changes in the lives or circumstances of persons or an area served by project activities. Longer term outcomes are the changes in the lives or circumstances of persons or area served by a project that are hallmarks of project goals.