

NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE
EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM



VOLUME I

PROGRAM HISTORIES:
SEVEN CONSORTIUM UNIVERSITIES

MEMBER SCHOOLS:

Arizona State University
Eastern Kentucky University
Michigan State University
Northeastern University
Portland State University
University of Maryland
University of Nebraska at Omaha

43762

NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE
EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM REPORTS

GENERAL EDITORS: James W. Fox,
Don C. Gibbons, Peter P. Lejins,
John H. McNamara, Norman Rosenblatt,
I. Gayle Shuman, Vincent J. Webb
(NCJEC Board of Directors)

VOLUME I

PROGRAM HISTORIES:
SEVEN CONSORTIUM UNIVERSITIES

CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS: Gerald F. Blake,
James W. Fox, Don C. Gibbons, Peter
P. Lejins, John H. McNamara, Norman
Rosenblatt, I. Gayle Shuman, Victor
G. Strecher, Samuel Walker, Vincent
J. Webb

VOLUME EDITORS: Gilbert H. Bruns
Carolyn O'Hearn

1976

NCJRS
NOV 14 1977
NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE
EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM

This project was supported by Grants Numbers 71 and 72 CD 99 0001; 72 and 73 CD 99 0002; 73 CD 99 0003, -4, -5; and 74 CD 99 0001, -2, -3 awarded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration reserves the right to reproduce, publish, translate, or otherwise use, and to authorize others to publish and use all or any part of the copyrighted material contained in this publication.

Copyright: 1976
National Criminal Justice
Educational Consortium

PREFACE

This volume is the first in a series of four Reports growing out of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium project. This Consortium was funded in 1973 by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and involved seven universities. The project was a three-year endeavor designed to lead to the development or strengthening of graduate programs in criminal justice at the seven member institutions: the University of Maryland, Michigan State University, Arizona State University, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Portland State University, Northeastern University, and Eastern Kentucky University. The first two of these universities had master's and doctoral programs in existence at the time of the creation of the Consortium, while the other five were charged with developing new graduate programs.

As in all human events, individual historical episodes are to some degree unique. In the case of this educational development experience, each of the seven member universities differed from the others in a number of important ways. The criminal justice program development events at the individual institutions varied in many ways from one university to another. Volume I, Program Histories: The Seven Consortium Institutions,

presents detailed narrative accounts of the particular experiences at each of the seven universities. The interested reader can learn a good deal about the nuances of university life, curriculum development, and related matters from these seven program analyses in Volume I.

But, the historian's task is also one of extracting commonalities of experience out of somewhat parallel historical experiences. Although no two economic developments, revolutions, wars, or educational experiences are entirely similar, some common threads can be discerned among them. Volume II, An Analysis of the Consortium Endeavor, centers about the shared problems, successes and failures, and other experiences undergone by the seven Consortium institutions. Volume II should be of considerable value not only to those readers who are interested in graduate education in criminal justice but also to students of educational organizations who wish to learn about the broader topics of educational innovation, curriculum development, or educational consortia.

One of the core questions or issues regarding graduate education in criminal justice has to do with manpower needs. How many persons with advanced degrees in criminal justice will be needed in future decades? How many positions in educational institutions, criminal justice agencies, or other organizations will actually open up to holders of graduate degrees in criminal justice? What kinds of specific skills and knowledge will be required of those criminal justice graduates? Volume III,

Criminal Justice Education Manpower Survey, presents the results of a comprehensive attempt on the part of the Consortium institutions to provide some tentative answers to these queries.

The issue of the substantive content of criminal justice graduate programs is addressed in various places throughout these four volumes, as is the companion question of the most appropriate institutional location for graduate programs in criminal justice. Each of the seven Consortium institutions had to face these and related questions. However, Volume IV, Criminal Justice Doctoral Education: Issues and Perspectives, is focused specifically upon key issues in criminal justice education. This Report draws heavily from the proceedings of a conference on criminal justice doctoral education held at the University of Nebraska at Omaha on October 21-23, 1975. The reader will encounter a good many provocative analyses of the problems and prospects for the emerging field of criminal justice within the pages of Volume IV.

The Directors and staff members of the seven Consortium institution projects regard these four volumes as a major product of the educational development experience. Final answers to major questions are not presented in these volumes, for such propositions would be highly premature. The final outlines of criminal justice graduate education are not yet entirely clear. Much work remains to be done toward the development of criminal justice graduate education that speaks to the central issues of

crime control in modern society. But, if we have managed to identify some of the major problems that cry out for attention, the purposes of these volumes will have been achieved.

The supervision and general editorship of these Reports was the responsibility of the Consortium Board of Directors, composed of the Project Directors of the seven Consortium universities: Peter P. Lejins, Chairman, University of Maryland; Norman Rosenblatt, Vice Chairman, Northeastern University; John H. McNamara, former Chairman, University of Michigan; James W. Fox, Eastern Kentucky University; Don C. Gibbons, Portland State University; I. Gayle Shuman, Arizona State University; and Vincent J. Webb, University of Nebraska at Omaha. A Consortium Reports Committee chaired by Peter P. Lejins was appointed by the Board of Directors. Membership of this committee has included Gilbert H. Bruns, James W. Fox, Norman Rosenblatt, and Vincent J. Webb.

Responsibility for the overall organization of these many efforts, including outlining, editing, writing of certain portions, typing, proofreading, reproduction, and assembly of the Reports rested with the staff of the Office of the Coordinator: Gilbert H. Bruns, Coordinator; Pat (Wilson) Young, former Assistant to the Coordinator; Carolyn O'Hearn, Publications Liaison Specialist; Charlotte C. Howard and Elaine Stern, Project Assistants; and Marilyn Thompson, secretary.

The representatives of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium wish to take this opportunity to express

their appreciation for both the financial and moral support of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, without which these volumes and the achievements reported in them would not have been possible. Gratitude is due especially to Administrator Richard W. Velde, J. Price Foster, Director of the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training, and Program Managers Carl W. Hamm and Jean F. Moore.

Although the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration provided the funding for the Consortium, the views presented in these volumes do not necessarily represent the opinions and views of that agency. Instead, the claims and conclusions advanced in these pages should be attributed to the members of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

1.	ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY PROGRAM HISTORY	4
2.	EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY PROGRAM HISTORY	50
3.	MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY PROGRAM HISTORY	136
4.	NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY PROGRAM HISTORY	209
5.	PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY PROGRAM HISTORY	219
6.	UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND PROGRAM HISTORY	260
7.	UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA PROGRAM HISTORY	331

INTRODUCTION

The National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium was comprised of seven universities: Arizona State University, Eastern Kentucky University, Michigan State University, Northeastern University, the University of Maryland, and the University of Nebraska at Omaha. This volume of the Reports contains the program histories of the seven institutions. These histories were written by the Project Directors--in some cases with the assistance of other informed individuals--of the 406(e) grant projects at the seven universities. For several reasons, there is considerable variety in the nature of these program histories.

At the time of the receipt of the 406(e) grants, the criminal justice programs of the seven grantees were at widely differing stages of development. Two schools, Michigan State University and the University of Maryland, already had doctoral programs in criminal justice in place. Eastern Kentucky University offered undergraduate and master's degrees in criminal justice. Northeastern University, Portland State University, and the University of Nebraska at Omaha had undergraduate--but no graduate--programs. Arizona State University offered neither undergraduate nor graduate programs in criminal justice.

The institutions containing those programs also varied greatly. The University of Maryland has had a long history both as an institution and a university. Portland State University, on the other hand, has had a relatively brief history as an institution. Most of the schools have been in existence --in some form or another--for some time, although their tenure as universities may have been relatively brief. It should also be noted that most of these institutions are urban institutions and that six are public universities--Northeastern being the only private institution among the seven.

The perspectives of the authors of these program histories also differ considerably. Although in all cases the author, or one of the coauthors, was the Project Director of the 406(e) grant at his institution, their relationships with their institutions varied greatly in other respects. The Project Director at the University of Maryland has had a decades-long tenure at that institution and intimate involvement with its criminology program almost from its inception. None of the other Project Directors had such a long involvement with either their institution or its criminal justice program. Some had a previous association with the university--but not with its criminal justice program. Others were recruited by their university for its 406(e) project. In three instances, there was a change in Project Director during the three-year grant period. In those cases, the authors were not intimately involved in the early stages of the 406(e) projects at their universities.

The administrative location of the criminal justice program and the other roles played by its Project Director also affect the telling of the narratives. At Northeastern University the Project Director was Dean of the College of Criminal Justice and previously had held other administrative positions in the University. Conversely, at Michigan State University the 406(e) funds were used principally for a research center, and the Project Director functioned as head of that center but did not assume other major administrative responsibilities.

For all of the reasons cited above--the differences in the programs, the differences in the institutions, the differences in the perspectives of the Project Directors--it was agreed from the beginning that no common outline could be adhered to in the individual narratives. Consequently, the reader should be aware that the content and the organization of the program histories vary greatly. In addition, no common point of view in time is maintained among the seven narratives. Some Project Directors wrote their reports several months before the termination of their 406(e) grants; others waited until after that point. Some directors wrote sections of their reports over a period of several months while others wrote a complete report with later revisions. Although every effort has been made to maintain as much consistency as possible, the reader should not assume that the time frame remains the same among the seven program histories--or even within the individual narrative.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY PROGRAM HISTORY

By

I. Gayle Shuman

THE SETTING

Arizona State University occupies a somewhat unusual position among the seven universities which constitute the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium. The oldest educational institution in the Southwest, it is, nevertheless, one of the youngest universities of the seven. ASU is located in the heart of one of the fastest growing areas of the nation and, in common with Michigan State University and the University of Maryland, lies within the metroplex surrounding the state's capital city.

THE STATE

Since the end of World War II, Arizona, the youngest state within the continental limits of the United States, has grown rapidly, with the greatest surge occurring in the fifties and sixties. This growth is a result of many factors, not the

least of which are equable winter climate in the desert areas and a geographic diversity which ranges from low deserts to high mountains, from man-made wonders such as Hoover Dam to such natural wonders as the Grand Canyon and the Painted Desert.

THE METROPLEX

Phoenix, Arizona's capital, and the satellite communities of Sun City, Glendale, Scottsdale, Chandler, Tempe, and Mesa suffer from the problems of any "boom" area, as well as from the problems inherent in seats of government. These metroplex cities are, for the most part, new cities. Most of the old landmarks--remnants of territorial days--are gone, and most of the pre-World War II buildings have been replaced with glittering modern structures, many of them designed by world-famous architects such as Frank Lloyd Wright.

In common with other rapid-growth areas, the metroplex faces numerous problems. Public services, for example, lag behind demand, and police and fire departments are understaffed. In addition, several problems not common to all rapidly growing areas plague the Phoenix area.

The greater Phoenix area has a population that is at once stable and ever-changing. The core of the population comprises people of all classes and economic conditions, from non-English speaking, unemployed poor to enormously wealthy businessmen and industrialists. The vast majority of the people, however, are hard-working, middle-class citizens of all ethnic groups, struggling to raise their families in an inflationary world

just as are their counterparts throughout the United States. In this respect, the Phoenix metroplex is no different from other large urban areas of the nation.

Despite all the problems, however--problems which are certainly shared to some degree by all areas of urban sprawl--Arizona, particularly the Phoenix metroplex, has much to offer in the way of good living. Since modern air conditioning now provides the means of coping with the three unbearably hot summer months of June, July, and August, its healthful, moderate winter climate attracts more people each year. As the energy crisis mounts and the shortage of heating fuel increases, even more people can be expected to migrate to Arizona. More people, of course, mean more crime and more social problems. Thus, the need for increased facilities to educate and train criminal justice personnel has become acute. It is because of this need that the criminal justice program at Arizona State University has evolved.

THE UNIVERSITY

When it was founded in 1885, the Territorial Normal School of the Territory of Arizona (the first of a series of many names for the institution now known as Arizona State University) was the only institution of higher learning in the 1200-mile expanse of desert and mountains lying between Provo, Utah, on the north and the Mexican border on the south, and between Austin, Texas, on the east and Los Angeles, California, on the west.

By the fall of 1945, Arizona State Teachers College, as it had been known since 1929, had 553 students. The institution, which had been in continual, although sometimes shaky, operation for 60 years, was still only a small school. Except for a brief period immediately prior to World War II when enrollment had risen to 1341, the school had served a relatively static student body of 500 to 600 students. Within the next 30 years, however, this modest teachers college would become a major university; the fall enrollment figure would rise from the 553 of 1945 to more than 30,000 in the fall of 1975.

The same equable climate which attracts so many people to the Phoenix area also attracts a high quality faculty to the University. A young university, ASU has neither the funds nor the established reputation of many older schools, yet a number of distinguished and highly respected faculty members with illustrious reputations have come to ASU, drawn not only by the healthful climate and relaxed life-style but also by the opportunities to develop challenging educational programs. For the same reasons, many promising young scholars have also come to ASU.

Another attraction--one which is a continuing source of pleasure to many faculty and students--is the beautiful campus. The main campus, stretching south from the Tempe buttes, encompasses over 430 acres. Perhaps the most striking feature of the campus is the beautiful landscaping, a legacy from an early president, Dr. Arthur John Matthews, an enthusiastic

horticulturist. Mature palm trees and orange trees, interesting desert plants, and blooming flowers ornament the well-kept lawns. The luxuriant vegetation not only softens the desert heat; it also serves to unify the heterogeneous styles and materials of the buildings.

The University offers excellent research facilities for the graduate student as well as for the undergraduate student. Of particular interest to students in the Center of Criminal Justice are the Law Library, housing some 107,000 volumes, and the Charles Trumbull Hayden Library, with holdings in excess of 1,500,000 volumes, including a number of notable special collections.

The administrative structure of Arizona State University is basically similar to that of most universities, although a few differences do exist. The primary responsibility for governing the three state universities lies with the Board of Regents for the State of Arizona. Local administration at Arizona State University is composed of the President, Dr. John W. Schwada, and vice presidents. Responsible to the Academic Vice President are the Deans of the Colleges of Liberal Arts, Education, Architecture, Nursing, Engineering, Business Administration, Fine Arts, Law, the Dean of the Graduate School of Social Service Administration, the Dean of Summer Sessions and Extensions, and the Director of the Center of Criminal Justice.

THE PROCESS

The primary purpose of this volume of the Consortium Reports is to describe the unique process used by each of the Consortium schools in developing or strengthening its graduate program in criminal justice. Since the undergraduate and graduate programs were developed simultaneously at ASU, any description of the development of the graduate program must, therefore, include some comment on the undergraduate program.

Kurt Lewin has identified a model of organizational development that furnishes an appropriate reference point on which to base a description of the complex series of events that evolved during the development of the undergraduate and graduate programs in criminal justice at Arizona State University. Lewin suggests that behavior within an organization is never static but is, rather, a dynamic balance between forces working in opposite directions resulting in a "quasi-stationary equilibrium." Change, or "unfreezing," takes place when an imbalance occurs between the sum of the "driving forces" (those attempting to effect change) and the sum of the "restraining forces" (those attempting to maintain the status quo), either through a change in direction of one or more of these forces or through the addition of a new force.

Since the early 1960's, sporadic attempts had been made by local criminal justice agencies to have the University establish a specialized curriculum and an identifiable degree in the area of criminal justice. The major impetus for such a program

came from law enforcement agencies and generally took the form of a request to establish a specialized curriculum in police administration. Because these "driving forces" were neither well organized nor consistent in their requests, the "quasi-stationary equilibrium" was, in reality, quite static. Some "unfreezing" did occur in the middle 1960's when, as the result of an intensified drive by the law enforcement agencies, the University established a public safety specialty in the Departments of Political Science and Sociology. This slight shift in the equilibrium momentarily diverted the driving forces, and the situation soon refroze without significant change having occurred.

It was not until 1971 that three significant events occurred which were to result in a total unfreezing of the equilibrium and a final movement toward a new equilibrium that has not yet been fully established. The first of these events was the arrival in the summer of 1971 of Dr. John W. Schwada as President of the University. The second of these events occurred shortly after Dr. Schwada's arrival, when an intensified effort was again initiated by the local law enforcement agencies to have the University establish a baccalaureate program in police administration. The third event involved a renewed interest by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in graduate criminal justice education, resulting in LEAA's solicitation, in December 1971, of proposals for the Centers of Excellence program.

By early 1972, the stage was set for the development of a criminal justice program at the University. During the following months, a number of individuals and groups became involved. Because of the large number of people involved, it is impossible to include the contributions which each person or group made to the process that followed. To reconstruct the complex events, involving hundreds of people for more than four years, is a difficult task; to do so with a minimum of bias and with any degree of accuracy is a nearly impossible task. The process will, therefore, be described through the author's interpretation of three of these groups: the University administration, the University faculty, and the criminal justice agencies.

THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

For many years, one of the obvious restraining forces in the development of a criminal justice program was the administration of the University. Although the single individuals comprising an administration may be innocuous in themselves, the administration of any university frequently becomes an ominous restraining force when it operates as a group. Some students of higher education would suggest that this phenomenon is not so much an organized resistance to change as it is an aversion to personal risk-taking or an innate inability to do anything other than maintain the status quo. Whatever the cause, the administration of Arizona State University appeared to most observers to be the bulwark of the restraining forces prior to the arrival of President Schwada.

Dr. Schwada, who came to ASU from the University of Missouri, was preceded by his reputation as a forceful administrator with a strong commitment to institutional sensitivity and responsiveness to community needs. His leadership of the nation's tenth largest university succeeded that of an acting president who had been induced by the Governing Board to extend a one-year interim appointment to two years. These two years under a custodial president, joined with Dr. Schwada's known commitment to community-oriented programs, combined to create a high degree of receptivity in the administration for an academic program such as criminal justice.

This, then, was the mood when the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration solicited proposals for the Centers of Excellence program. Those administrators who had sought such a program in the past found renewed hope in LEAA's announcement; they soon mustered sufficient support among other administrators to have a meeting of academic deans to consider the feasibility of the University's developing such a proposal.

The meeting, held on February 16, 1972, was attended by the Academic Vice President; the Vice President for Graduate Studies; the Director of Research Grants and Contracts; the Dean of the Graduate School of Social Service Administration; the Dean of Summer School and Extension; and the Deans of the Colleges of Liberal Arts, Education, and Law. Those in attendance unanimously agreed that the University should proceed to develop a proposal. Each academic dean present agreed to

appoint one or more faculty members from his college or school to serve on the proposal committee.

This meeting was the turning point for the administration. Since that date the administration has strongly supported the Center of Criminal Justice at Arizona State University. For the most part, this support has enhanced the growth of the academic program of the Center. Not only has the University constantly exceeded its original financial commitment to the Center, but the President's public support of the program has also neutralized a number of the restraining forces.

On some occasions, however, the strong support by the administration has intensified the restraining forces. Some faculties oppose anything the administration advocates, no matter how worthy the cause. The more "heavy-footed" the administration becomes in supporting a cause, the more intense the opposition from certain academic areas.

THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

After the meeting of the Vice President and the academic deans on February 16, each academic dean was contacted and asked to appoint one or more faculty members from his college to serve on the LEAA Proposal Committee. No attempt was made to influence the deans' selection of faculty members to serve on the committee. However, the supporters of the proposal were concerned to some degree that if faculty members were selected who opposed a criminal justice program--or federal funding of such programs--the situation would refreeze and the

entire effort would die before it started. Fortunately, either consciously or subconsciously, the respective deans selected faculty members who were favorable to the task at hand, and the committee, remaining intact with one exception, was a major factor in the success of the program.

The first meeting of the LEAA Proposal Committee was held on February 23, 1972. The membership of this committee consisted of tenured faculty from the Departments of Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology in the College of Liberal Arts, and one member from each of the following: the Colleges of Law, Education, Business Administration, Engineering, and the Graduate School of Social Service Administration. The Dean of Summer Sessions and Extensions and the Director of the Office of Research Grants and Contracts were also members of the committee.

The committee was briefed on the status of the University's efforts to date and given what limited information was available concerning national trends in criminal justice education. The committee was also advised of President Schwada's support of the proposal.

One of the first acts of the committee was to establish an Advisory Committee composed of functioning criminal justice personnel. This committee subsequently became known as the Agency Advisory Committee, with the Faculty Committee being known as the Faculty Advisory Committee.

The Faculty Advisory Committee and the Agency Advisory Committee met frequently during the following weeks, with their efforts culminating in a proposal that was submitted to LEAA in March 1972. On September 11, 1972, President Schwada was advised by LEAA that the University had not been selected to participate in the Centers of Excellence program.

During the five months which had elapsed between the time the proposal was submitted and the time the University was advised that it had not been selected, the two committees continued to meet on an irregular basis. One member had resigned from the Faculty Advisory Committee at the request of his department; the faculty of his department had voted not to participate in the project, since federal funds were involved.

Other members of the Faculty Advisory Committee continued during this interim period to exhibit a high degree of motivation and interest in developing a program in criminal justice and undertook a number of projects which were to have major effects upon the future of the Center.

One such project was a survey of each academic department to determine the interest of other faculty members in such a program. Each department chairperson was contacted personally, informed of the pending proposal, and asked to survey his department to determine what contributions his faculty could make, either collectively or individually, to an interdisciplinary program. Within three weeks more than 200 faculty members, representing such diverse disciplines as Speech and

Theatre, Home Economics, Geography, Physical Education, and Economics, had indicated an interest in participating in some way in such a program. These lists are still being used to identify faculty members who are interested in research and teaching in the field of criminal justice.

Such momentum had been developed among the Faculty Advisory Committee that, when it was advised that the University had not been selected as one of the Centers of Excellence schools, the Committee voted to rewrite the proposal for an undergraduate curriculum and submit it to the Arizona State Justice Planning Agency (ASJPA). The rewritten proposal was submitted to the ASJPA in September 1972. The proposal, identifying nine specific tasks to be accomplished during a twelve-month period, included the establishment of a Center of Criminal Justice and the development of an undergraduate curriculum in criminal justice.

One of the early concerns of the staff of the ASJPA was the commitment which the University was willing to make to continue the program once outside funding ceased. To address this concern, the Faculty Advisory Committee encouraged the University to establish, prior to funding by the ASJPA, a Center of Criminal Justice as an indication of the University's commitment.

President Schwada officially established the Center of Criminal Justice on December 1, 1972, and designated it as the University's research and service unit in the field of criminal

justice. Although the University had several other centers and institutes attached to academic departments within the existing colleges, President Schwada instructed the Director of the Center of Criminal Justice to report directly to the Office of the Academic Vice President.

Without any assurance of state or federal funding, the Center became operational in January 1973, with the appointment of a director and a secretary. The Center's first office consisted of a large, unpartitioned classroom, two desks, four chairs, a file cabinet, and a telephone. With a commitment of only six-months' funding from the University, the Center was launched on shaky ground.

A month later, in February 1973, the Center received a grant from ASJPA, part of which was to be used to develop an undergraduate curriculum in criminal justice. And five months later, in July, the Center received a grant from LEAA to develop a graduate program in criminal justice. Both grants provided money for released-time for faculty to assist in the development of the undergraduate and graduate curricula. Since the Faculty Advisory Committee had been involved in the planning from the beginning, it was natural to look to members of this committee for assistance. However, because the ASJPA grant had been awarded after the beginning of the spring semester, only one member of the Faculty Advisory Committee, Dr. George Chartier, Assistant Professor of Psychology, could be released and loaned to the Center on a part-time basis. Other members

of the Faculty Advisory Committee continued to meet on a regular basis to review and pass on curriculum suggestions made by the Center staff and Dr. Chartier. During the summer of 1973, several members of the Committee were able to work full-time on the development of both the undergraduate and graduate curricula, and, by the end of the summer, an undergraduate proposal had been developed and submitted to the Academic Vice President for processing through the University.

University procedures do not require the Faculty Senate to approve new undergraduate degree programs; however, it is necessary that they be advised by the Academic Vice President of new undergraduate programs. In October 1973, Academic Vice President Dannenfeldt advised the Senate of the proposed new undergraduate program in criminal justice. The proposal was then forwarded by President Schwada that same month to the Long-Range Planning Committee of the Board of Regents. On December 15, 1973, the Board of Regents authorized Arizona State University to award a Bachelor of Science degree in Criminal Justice.

The first undergraduate classes were initiated a month later at the beginning of the spring semester, and the first baccalaureate was awarded in December 1974. The ease with which the undergraduate program was approved gave the Center staff and the Faculty Advisory Committee a great deal of confidence. The success of the Center until that point had been nothing short of spectacular. Two out of three grant proposals

had been funded, an innovative undergraduate curriculum had been developed and implemented, a strong faculty had been recruited, and nearly 200 students had been enrolled the first semester. To say that everyone had a feeling of omnipotence is an understatement. It appeared that all restraining forces had been completely neutralized.

However, problems soon developed between the Center staff and the Faculty Advisory Committee. Four specific incidents can be identified which contributed to the ultimate demise of the Faculty Advisory Committee as a major influence in the academic programs of the Center.

The first problem to surface was the question of faculty. Who would teach the new classes? Three members of the Faculty Advisory Committee were on released-time from their academic departments to assist the Center staff in the development of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. Only one member agreed to teach a class. The other two agreed to continue in an "administrative" capacity but did not want to teach.

The four members of the Center's administrative staff who had terminal degrees agreed to teach one class each, without extra compensation, in addition to their administrative duties. The determination of their academic rank and the question of who would make that determination became the second problem. Because of the intimate involvement of the Faculty Advisory Committee with the Center staff, the Office of the Academic Vice President turned to the Faculty Advisory Committee for input.

One member of the Center staff had been a tenured associate professor at another university, a second had been an assistant professor at another university, and the remaining two had never held academic rank. The latter two, however, had several years of university administrative experience. In addition, one had taught at the high school level for several years and the other part-time at a community college. It was the recommendation of the Faculty Advisory Committee that the former tenured associate professor be offered the rank of assistant professor; the former assistant professor be offered the rank of associate professor; and, of the two who had never held academic rank, one be offered the rank of associate professor and the other not be offered professorial rank.

These recommendations resulted in an open confrontation between the Center staff and the Faculty Advisory Committee. After lengthy discussions with the Assistant Academic Vice President, the Office of the Vice President accepted two of these recommendations and altered the remaining two.

The Faculty Advisory Committee's recommendation on academic rank raised the third issue: what should be the role of the Faculty Advisory Committee in the academic affairs of the Center? It was the opinion of some members of the Faculty Advisory Committee that, since the faculty of the Center lacked "experience" in administering an academic unit, the Faculty Advisory Committee should assume the role of the "faculty" of the Center and determine academic policy until the new faculty

gained sufficient experience to govern themselves. It was the unanimous opinion of the Center faculty that academic tradition dictated that they assume all rights and responsibilities of a faculty and that they needed no help from the Faculty Advisory Committee in administering the academic affairs of the Center.

These three issues arose and were resolved in a matter of a few weeks. It was a fourth issue, which surfaced when the master's proposal was submitted to the Graduate Council, that effectively caused the actual demise of the Faculty Advisory Committee as a major influence in the affairs of the Center. This fourth issue involved a general feeling among the Center faculty that most Faculty Advisory Committee members had been negligent in keeping their respective departments and colleges informed of the developments at the Center. It was also felt that some members of the committee had lost the very perspective for which they had been selected--a perspective which was to reflect their respective academic disciplines--and had, instead, tended to reach decisions based upon more personal, hidden feelings and opinions.

This was the state of affairs in the early spring of 1974. Fortunately, the proposal for the Master of Science degree in Criminal Justice was nearly completed when the difficulties occurred between the Center faculty and the Faculty Advisory Committee.

The master's proposal was developed following the same general methods used in developing the baccalaureate proposal.

The Agency Advisory Committee met frequently with the Faculty Advisory Committee and the Center staff in the development of the proposal, with the result that the final proposal was acceptable to all concerned.

The procedures required for approval by the University of a new graduate degree are significantly different from those required for the approval of a new undergraduate degree. All proposals for a new graduate degree must be approved first by the Graduate Council and then by the Faculty Senate, before being sent to the Board of Regents. The proposal for the Master of Science degree in Criminal Justice was forwarded to the Graduate Council by the Academic Vice President in March 1974.

It is the policy of the Graduate Council to appoint a subcommittee to study proposals for new graduate programs. The subcommittee selected to review the proposal for the Master of Science degree program in Criminal Justice was chaired by a professor from the Department of Secondary Education; professors from the departments of Psychology, Sociology, Counselor Education, and Foreign Language were members. The subcommittee held its first meeting on April 12, 1974, and issued its report to the Graduate Council on May 2.

The report opened with the statement that all members agreed with the need for a graduate program in criminal justice. The report then listed seven areas which the subcommittee viewed with concern:

The first area of concern was that, among the courses to be offered in the criminal justice program, there appeared to be a duplication of courses offered by other academic departments. The report listed, as an example, two proposed courses in research which appeared to duplicate twelve courses offered in other departments.

The second area was that the program might take on the flavor of being an "easy" program if all or most of the course work were offered within the Center. The third area of concern was that, under the program as outlined in the proposal, criminal justice majors in the Southwest would not have the exposure to the culture and language of the Southwest, particularly to Spanish, which the subcommittee felt was necessary for these students' success in their chosen field.

The fourth area which concerned the subcommittee was that graduates of the program would be in competition with graduates from the programs in counselor education and in sociology. The fifth concern was the lack of prerequisites for courses listed in the program. The sixth was whether or not the State of Arizona had the financial resources to maintain such a program.

The seventh and last concern of the subcommittee was the location of the Center within the administrative structure of the University. It was noted in the report that all other University Centers are attached to an academic department within an existing college; however, the Center of Criminal Justice "is not attached to an academic unit."

The subcommittee's report was discussed at the regular Graduate Council meeting on May 7, 1974. In addition to discussing the issues raised in the subcommittee report, members of the Graduate Council, who appeared to have little or no knowledge of the Center, raised numerous questions concerning the baccalaureate program and the qualifications of the faculty. Some members of the Council were concerned that the Center did not have sufficient experience in operating a baccalaureate program to launch a graduate program.

Since the Faculty Senate already had held its final meeting for the academic year and would not meet until the following September, it was recommended by the Graduate Council that the proposal be rewritten by the Center faculty during the summer of 1974 and resubmitted to the Council at their first meeting the following fall.

In analyzing the actions of the Graduate Council, three things became apparent: (1) the fact that all full-time and part-time faculty members had terminal degrees was of immense benefit in overcoming objections to the quality of the program; (2) it was apparent that the members of the Faculty Advisory Committee had not kept their respective departments informed of the progress of the graduate proposal; and (3) the Graduate Council did not want the approval of a master's program to be taken as tacit approval of a doctoral program, should such a proposal be forthcoming.

In August 1974, a completely rewritten proposal was submitted to the Graduate Council at its first meeting of the academic year. The council approved the rewritten proposal and forwarded it to the Faculty Senate in October. After the Faculty Senate approved the proposal at its first meeting in November, President Schwada forwarded the proposal to the Board of Regents the same month. Since the Board had previously been advised that such a proposal was forthcoming, no problems in receiving Board approval were anticipated. This assumption proved to be erroneous.

The Board of Regents governs three state universities: the University of Arizona in Tucson, Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff, and Arizona State University in Tempe. The oldest criminal justice program in Arizona is offered by Northern Arizona University--an undergraduate program in Police Science which has existed for a number of years, operating as an independent academic department in the College of Arts and Science. The University of Arizona offers an area of concentration in correctional administration at both the undergraduate and graduate level within the Department of Public Administration, which is one of several departments in the College of Public and Business Administration.

The details of what happened at the December meeting of the Board of Regents are not entirely clear. It was reported that at the Friday work session preceding the open meeting on Saturday, the Regents, after lengthy discussion, voted to table

for a year the proposal from Arizona State University for the Master of Science program in Criminal Justice. This vote was consistent with a recommendation made by the Academic Coordinator of the Board of Regents Central Staff. Newspaper accounts of the Friday session reported that some members of the Board felt the proposed program duplicated existing programs at the University of Arizona and Northern Arizona University. Not reported by the local papers was the fact that, after the vote to table the Arizona State University proposal, the Regents approved a Master of Science degree in Police Science at Northern Arizona University. As a result of the approval of the master's degree program at Northern Arizona University and the subsequent approval of the appointment of Colonel James J. Hegarty, former Director of the Arizona Department of Public Safety, as a full professor in the Center of Criminal Justice, the proposal for the master's degree program at Arizona State University was reconsidered and was approved by the Board later in the same meeting.

At that time the Regents were engaged in an ongoing controversy with the local press regarding a newly enacted open-meeting law, requiring all governmental agencies to decide all policies, procedures, etc., in a meeting open to the public. The climax of this controversy was reached at this December 1974 meeting when, on the following day, the newspapers carried headlines accusing the Regents of approving the Arizona State University proposal in a "secret" session in violation of the

open-meeting law. A suit was subsequently filed by several groups asking the Court to make null and void all actions of the Regents at their December 1974 meeting. Although a large number of items were acted upon by the Regents at this meeting, the controversy centered upon the criminal justice program at Arizona State University. Never was the master's degree program at Northern Arizona University mentioned, and, to this day, most people are not aware that this program was approved at the same meeting.

This controversy between the Regents and the press was cause for a great deal of concern among the faculty of the Center. Since the suit would take several months to resolve should it go to court and since the Regents were not scheduled to meet again until after the beginning of the spring semester, the central question was whether the University should proceed with the initiation of a master's program before the issue was settled or wait until fall to offer graduate classes.

President Schwada's decision was that the University should proceed on the assumption that the Regents had not acted illegally in approving the program. Graduate classes were initiated in mid-January, with more than 60 students being admitted to the program. In January, the Regents voted in an open meeting to approve all items approved at their December meeting, thus nullifying any technical violation which might have occurred.

Although the merits of the master's degree program were never an issue--in fact, the need for such a program was frequently supported by the press--the entire controversy surrounding the approval of the program had a depressing effect on everyone involved. In light of this controversy and the concerns of the Graduate Council, it was decided to postpone work on the doctoral program until fall, although a draft of a proposal had been furnished the Graduate Council several months previously.

During the spring and summer session of 1975, the faculty of the Center devoted its entire effort to the implementation of the master's program.

In late summer 1975, it was decided work should begin again on the doctoral proposal. In view of the difficulties encountered in obtaining approval of the master's program, the Vice President for Graduate Studies was asked to appoint a subcommittee of the Graduate Council to work with the Center faculty in the development of the proposal. This decision was based upon two factors: First, the Faculty Advisory Committee had been inactive for more than a year. Although it was felt by some Center faculty that the Faculty Advisory Committee members had been negligent in keeping their respective departments informed of the development of the master's proposal, there was unanimous agreement that the benefits derived from input from a variety of academic disciplines were invaluable in the development of an interdisciplinary curriculum. Secondly, one of the

major difficulties encountered previously with the Graduate Council appeared to originate from a lack of information concerning the development process, input from other academic disciplines, etc. If the council were involved from the start, its members would not only be aware of the efforts involved in the development of the proposal but could also make significant contributions from a broad base of academic disciplines, a factor otherwise lacking with the demise of the Faculty Advisory Committee.

On October 7, 1975, after several requests from the Director of the Center, the Vice President for Graduate Studies appointed a subcommittee of the Graduate Council, chaired by a professor of Sociology and comprised of members from the Departments of Psychology, Secondary Education, and Mathematics.

The chairman of the subcommittee was invited to attend the conference on Key Issues in Criminal Justice Doctoral Education held at the University of Nebraska at Omaha in October 1975. He participated actively in the discussions and returned to give a favorable report to the Graduate Council at its October meeting. However, it was decided that the Graduate Council should maintain its previous policy of not participating in the preparation of proposals. As a result, the subcommittee was directed to remain inactive until a formal proposal had been prepared by the Center faculty.

In summarizing the activities of the University faculty in the development of the Center and in the development of the

undergraduate and master's proposals, it must be said that they made significant contributions. Any opposition encountered was isolated and generally resolved by involving those opposed in the activities of the Center. Although the Faculty Advisory Committee has ceased to exist as such, several former members are actively involved in current activities of the Center. One former member has joined the Center as a full-time faculty member, and another is teaching part-time.

The Center staff and faculty are indebted to the individual faculty members from other academic departments and colleges who made valuable contributions to the program's development.

FUNCTIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES

One of the most controversial issues in criminal justice higher education is the degree of involvement of functional criminal justice agencies in the development and control of such programs. Since ASU is located near the state capital and in the population center of the state, the heads of all state criminal justice agencies as well as the heads of the state's largest county and municipal agencies are readily available to the University. Although the experience of Arizona State University with these agencies was not without its problems, it can be said that their contribution to the development of the Center and its programs was significant. Faculty members were pleasantly surprised by the positive attitude of most agency personnel toward higher education and the contributions they made to a sound academic program.

The Agency Advisory Committee was formed in February 1972, when Colonel James J. Hegarty, then Director of the Arizona Department of Public Safety, was requested to organize a committee to work with the faculty in the development of the proposal for the Centers of Excellence program. Colonel Hegarty subsequently appointed the Honorable Jack Hays, Chief Justice, Arizona Supreme Court; the Honorable Gary Nelson, then Attorney General for the State of Arizona; Chief Lawrence Wetzels, Chief of the Phoenix Police Department; Mr. Albert Brown, then Executive Director of the Arizona State Justice Planning Agency; Mr. Allen Cook, Director of the Arizona Department of Corrections (later replaced by Mr. John Moran); Mr. Ernesto Garcia, Director of the Maricopa County Juvenile Court Services; and Mr. Henry Duffie, Maricopa County Chief Adult Probation Officer. The Agency Advisory Committee met weekly with the Faculty Advisory Committee to develop the proposal for the Centers of Excellence program. After the proposal was submitted in April, the meetings became less regular until the following fall when a proposal was submitted to the Arizona State Justice Planning Agency for funding for the development of an undergraduate program.

When funding was secured from the ASJPA in February 1973, the Agency Advisory Committee resumed regular meetings with the Center staff and the Faculty Advisory Committee in the development of the undergraduate curriculum. It was the Agency Advisory Committee that identified the parameters for the

undergraduate curriculum. The committee insisted that what the agencies needed in an individual with a baccalaureate degree was not the how-to-do-it skills of a policeman, probation officer, or correctional worker. These skills they could teach, and would teach, once the individual was employed. What they wanted was an individual who could express himself or herself well both orally and in writing, who was a critical thinker, who had a broad liberal background, and who had an understanding and appreciation of the criminal justice system. They were, quite frankly, critical of academic programs that attempted to duplicate "academy" programs, especially police academies, and insisted from the start that educational institutions should do what they do best and let the agencies do what they do best.

This unanimous attitude among the original Agency Advisory Committee was totally unexpected by most members of the Faculty Advisory Committee. The Faculty Advisory Committee had approached the first joint committee meeting anticipating a difficult time in selling a liberal education to agency personnel. When it became apparent that both groups had similar beliefs on the role of higher education, a cohesiveness developed which was to last throughout the more than two years that they met.

The situation changed somewhat, but not significantly, when the Agency Advisory Committee established task forces to work with the Center staff in developing specific courses for the undergraduate curriculum. Three separate task forces--one

each for police, courts, and corrections--were established to provide input from all levels of the operational agencies. They met regularly with the Center staff in developing the undergraduate curriculum.

In the case of the police task force, there was a noticeable difference between their expectations from higher education and those of the Agency Advisory Committee. Most of the members of the police task force were captains, lieutenants, and sergeants, and a trend soon emerged toward developing courses specifically directed to the supervision and management problems of these middle and upper managers. They saw, as their most pressing need, the knowledge of how to deal with the nitty-gritty problems of selection, promotion, motivation, etc. These issues were finally resolved by convincing members of the task force that these subjects were best handled in advanced noncredit, in-service type programs rather than in an academic curriculum.

The procedures used to involve the task forces in the development of the undergraduate and graduate curricula were identical with two exceptions:

When developing the undergraduate curriculum, the Center staff developed data on issues to be discussed at each meeting and presented the data intact to the task forces. The task forces would then wrestle with all the unordered data and finally agree with the staff on a priority. This process was very cumbersome and time-consuming, but it allowed the task

forces to take part from the inception in making decisions affecting the development of the curriculum. In developing the master's curriculum, the task forces requested the Center staff to summarize the data, develop some priorities, and then make presentations for the task forces to react to. This greatly reduced the amount of time the task forces had to devote to the development of the graduate curriculum.

The second major difference in the procedures used in the development of the undergraduate and graduate curricula was that, for the graduate curriculum, the three task forces were combined into one. This had the distinct advantage of allowing an interplay among the different agencies and greatly reduced the efforts of the Center staff. With the undergraduate curriculum, the staff would meet with the police task force, obtain their input, then meet with the corrections task force for their input, and finally attempt to synthesize the information from each. With the graduate curriculum, the staff could, in one sitting, pull together the perceived needs of both groups. This method had the additional advantage of allowing each group to see the needs of the other group and helped them to come to the realization that the basic needs of both groups were actually quite similar.

In the development of both programs, the recommendations of the task forces were transmitted to the Agency Advisory Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee for their final review and approval. Final proposals were first reviewed by

the task forces and then given final approval by the Agency and Faculty Advisory Committees.

It might be appropriate at this point to note that the agency personnel, at both the task force level and the advisory committee level, consistently were more diligent in doing their "homework" than were the faculty. When information had been distributed prior to a meeting, the agency personnel would arrive at the meeting with the material thoroughly marked up and generally with additional information readily at hand. Most members of the Faculty Advisory Committee would arrive at the meeting having never read the material or reading it for the first time as they walked in the door.

There is little doubt that the functional criminal justice agencies made significant contributions to the development of the academic programs of the Center. The process of working with them was slow and sometimes cumbersome, but the results were always rewarding. The only difficulty ever experienced was that not everyone who wanted to participate could be included. With nearly 70 percent of all criminal justice personnel in the state assigned to agencies within a 20-mile radius of the campus, it was impossible to involve everyone.

It is the general consensus of those who developed the program that, in addition to being academically sound, it meets the needs of the functional agencies. The type of program developed does not, however, meet the needs of all individuals in the functional agencies, and, consequently, many agency

personnel who have enrolled in the program have dropped out after one or more semesters. The main problem appears to be that some people look to an academic program for solving immediate professional needs--which is really the purpose of in-service, noncredit training--and cannot see the relevance of a program that does not meet these immediate needs. There have also been in-service personnel who have dropped the program because of the rigorous demands of the faculty concerning term papers, tests, etc. Generally these were students who had been enrolled in community college programs where the faculty were in-service personnel, and grades were distributed according to rank and time of service rather than on the basis of academic accomplishments. These individuals have been by far in the minority, and most left the program within the first year.

THE PRODUCT

THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM

Early in the development of the undergraduate program, it became apparent to the Faculty Advisory Committee and to the Agency Advisory Committee that certain pitfalls can be expected in the development of a baccalaureate criminal justice program. On the one hand there is the tendency for a baccalaureate program to be completely dictated and controlled by functioning criminal justice agencies. This approach results in a "skills"--oriented curriculum which duplicates the efforts of the agencies' own recruit-training programs. Experience also indicates

that it is difficult for this type of program to gain status in an academic institution.

At the other extreme are those programs which have been developed without any input from the functioning criminal justice agencies. These tend to be highly theoretical programs which have no relevance to the needs of criminal justice agencies, resulting in their graduates having difficulty in obtaining employment. The Faculty and Agency Advisory Committees established as their original goal the development of a program that would be both academically sound and relevant to the needs of the functioning criminal justice agencies.

The first parameter decided upon prior to the actual development of the curriculum was that there were more similarities than differences between the needs of the agencies and the needs of an academic program. Information received from other educational institutions indicated that there was a definite national trend away from the fragmented track system (i.e., law enforcement, courts, and corrections) and toward treating the system as a whole. It was the opinion of the advisory committees that, rather than emphasizing the differences between the subsystems of the criminal justice system, the program should have as its primary thrust the objective of addressing the system as a unit.

The second major parameter agreed upon was that the criminal justice system could profitably utilize individuals from almost any academic discipline. This concept was emphasized

in part by the view of the Agency Advisory Committee that future personnel needs existed for a diversity of individuals such as personnel specialists, laboratory technicians, dietitians, lawyers, change agents, etc. Recognizing these needs, the committees decided to utilize all relevant existing academic programs and not to duplicate any program already offered in another academic department.

As a result of these decisions, a philosophy of criminal justice higher education at Arizona State University was adopted: Criminal justice is a multidisciplinary, problem-oriented field of scholarship, research, and teaching, embracing those aspects of social, behavioral, natural, and forensic sciences which are relevant to understanding crime and social deviancy and which entail a critical examination of the system as it has evolved for handling attendant problems. On the basis of this philosophy, the following general objectives of the baccalaureate program were established:

1. The curriculum should be generalist in nature.
2. The curriculum should be patterned after the 45-hour major used in the social sciences and should maintain a strong multidisciplinary foundation.
3. The orientation of the program should be entirely academic as opposed to skill training.
4. The student should be encouraged to utilize the 27 hours of upper division electives to

build a solid foundation in an existing academic discipline, i.e., management, sociology, psychology, quantitative systems, etc.

On the basis of these objectives, the undergraduate curriculum was designed as follows:

General Studies Requirements (54 hours)

Humanities and Fine Arts (12 hours)

Architecture
Art History
English
Foreign Languages
Humanities
Music
Philosophy

Social and Behavioral Sciences (12 hours)

Anthropology
Economics
Engineering
Geography
History
Political Science
Psychology
Sociology

Science and Mathematics (12 hours; at least one course must include a lab section.)

Anthropology
Botany and Microbiology
Chemistry
Geography--Physical
Geology
Mathematics
Physics
Psychology
Zoology

Other General Courses (18 hours)

Criminal Justice Core Requirements (30 hours)

The Criminal Justice System
Research and Statistics in Criminal Justice
Rehabilitation of the Criminal Offender
Law and Social Control
Criminal Justice Theory
Discretionary Justice

Electives (12 hours must be selected from the following)

Prevention of Delinquent and Criminal Behavior
Social Class and the Criminal Justice System
Organization and Administration of the Criminal Justice System
Substantive Criminal Law
Internship in Criminal Justice
Special Topics in Criminal Justice
Pro-Seminar
Independent Study

Related Criminal Justice Courses

One course from each of the following groups must be included in the 15 hours of related courses:

- Area 1. Basic Courses
- Area 2. Cultural and Historical Background Courses
- Area 3. Ethnic and Minority Groups
- Area 4. Understanding of Management
- Area 5. Understanding of the Helping Process.

Electives

A student is encouraged, in consultation with his advisor, to select an area of concentration in utilizing his 27 semester hours of electives.

Upper Division Semester Hours

Criminal justice students must have accumulated a minimum of 50 semester hours of upper division courses to qualify for graduation.

THE GRADUATE CURRICULUM

The philosophy of criminal justice education established by the advisory committees prior to the development of the undergraduate curriculum was used as the foundation for the development of the master's curriculum. Specific aims of the master's program are to prepare students for:

1. professional positions in functional criminal justice agencies;
2. teaching positions in community and four-year colleges; and
3. further study and research in the field of criminal justice.

The 36-semester hour graduate program of studies is divided into four phases:

Phase I. Phase I consists of 12 hours of general introduction to the criminal justice system. The core courses are designed to give the student an overview of the system. Included in the core are:

- CRJ 500 Criminal Justice Research Methods
- CRJ 501 The System of Criminal Justice
- CRJ 502 Organization and Management in Criminal Justice
- CRJ 503 Approaches to Understanding and Changing Criminal Behavior

Phase II. Phase II consists of 9-15 hours in a related academic discipline. Thirteen academic colleges or departments have been identified as being most directly related to the proposed master's program in criminal justice, but others may be added:

- Center for Public Affairs
- College of Law
- Department of Adult Education
- Department of Counselor Education
- Department of Economics
- Department of Educational Psychology
- Department of Management
- Department of Political Science
- Department of Psychology
- Department of Quantitative Systems
- Department of Special Education
- Department of Sociology
- Graduate School of Social Service Administration

Phase III. After completion of Phase I and Phase II, the student "returns" to the Center of Criminal Justice to complete 6 to 9 hours of course work in an area of specialization in criminal justice. The three areas of specialization available to the student are:

1. Criminal Justice Administration and Management
2. Criminal Justice Education, Theory, and Research
3. Social Systems and Human Resources

Courses in the area of specialization are designed to build upon the courses taken in the related academic discipline in Phase II. In essence, Phase III is an application of the theory obtained in Phase II. Courses included in Phase III are:

- CRJ 510 Understanding the Offender
- CRJ 511 Criminal Behavior: Programs and Techniques
for Change
- CRJ 512 Treatment Delivery Systems
- CRJ 530 Criminal Justice Education
- CRJ 540 Criminal Justice Administration
- CRJ 541 Criminal Justice Planning: Innovation and
Change

The areas of specialization in Administration and Management and in Social Systems and Human Resources are self-explanatory. The area of specialization in Education, Theory, and Research is the one which should be selected by students who want preparation for positions as training officers in functional agencies or as criminal justice instructors in community or four-year colleges. In addition, this area of specialization is designed for those students who wish to prepare themselves for study beyond the master's degree.

Phase IV. Phase IV consists of from 3 to 12 hours in one or more of the following criminal justice courses:

- CRJ 584 Internship in Criminal Justice
- CRJ 593 Thesis
- CRJ 601 Applied Project in Criminal Justice

A graphic illustration of the sequence of the program of studies is found on the next page.

PROGRAM MODEL

SEQUENCE OF PROGRAM OF STUDIES

PHASE I

CRIMINAL JUSTICE CORE
12 Hours

CRJ 500 Criminal Justice Research Methods
 CRJ 501 The System of Criminal Justice
 CRJ 502 Organization & Management in
 Criminal Justice
 CRJ 503 Approaches to Understanding &
 Changing Criminal Behavior

PHASE II

RELATED ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE
9-15 Hours

Adult Education	Management
Counselor Education	Political Science
Economics	Psychology
Educational Psychology	Public Affairs
G.S.S.S.A.	Quantitative Systems
Law	Special Education
Sociology	

PHASE III

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION
IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE
6-9 Hours

Criminal Justice Administration & Management
 Criminal Justice Education, Theory & Research
 Social Systems and Human Resources

PHASE IV

COURSES REQUIRED
TO COMPLETE MASTER'S
3-12 Hours

CRJ 601 Applied Project
 CRJ 584 Internship
 CRJ 593 Thesis

THE FUTURE

Although there are an infinite number of variables which can affect the success of an academic program, three factors are acknowledged by specialists in higher education to be of critical importance: administrative support, quality of both faculty and students, and curriculum strength.

As has been indicated earlier, the administration of Arizona State University not only made a strong commitment to develop a quality criminal justice program, but it has continued this strong commitment to support a quality program. After the expiration of the original ASJPA grant and prior to the completion of the funding of the program by LEAA, the University underwrote all faculty of the Center in addition to authorizing three new faculty positions for the academic year 1976-77.

It is this strong commitment by the administration that has enabled the Center to attract a highly qualified, interdisciplinary faculty. This faculty, possibly because of the support from the administration, has also formed a strong commitment to the field of criminal justice in general and to the Center of Criminal Justice at Arizona State University in particular. An aura of mutual respect for one another's discipline permeates the faculty and, because of this respect, it has developed into a cohesive unit with a unified goal and without the petty bickering so commonly found in the academic community. The faculty have been the key element in the success of the Center. Their most significant contribution has

been their individual and collective commitment to build an innovative and viable academic program. They possess a spirit of cooperation and cohesiveness seldom found in academia. This spirit enables them to multiply their individual strengths rather than dissipating them in self-seeking actions.

The student body attracted to the program at the Center of Criminal Justice is also of top quality. Approximately 1,000 students taking criminal justice courses are not majors but are students who simply want to broaden their educational background. Both majors and nonmajors, however, have consistently been students from the top grade-point ranks.

At the present time there are approximately 500 undergraduate and 200 graduate students, reflecting an approximate increase of 70 percent in student credit hours over the number in 1974-75. The 1976 fall projection, based on preenrollment and new admissions, is for an increase of 60 percent over the current year, 1975-76.

The third factor of paramount importance in the successful survival of an academic program is the strength of the curriculum. As has been noted earlier, the curriculum at the Center does not place an emphasis on "skill" courses. These, it is felt, are properly left to the functional agencies to be handled on an in-service basis. The curriculum of the Center does emphasize a broad approach to the field of criminal justice, recognizing that a graduate of the program needs to have as wide a base as possible in order to deal effectively with the people

and problems which he will encounter in the field. Thus, the core curriculum stresses professional development, exposing the student, for example, to the specifics of criminal or deviant behavior, to the law as it pertains to the specific field, to juvenile problems, etc., while the student's exposure to various areas of the humanities, sciences, and social sciences prepares him to deal with people, rather than with law. The graduate, therefore, has a base broad enough to enable him to function successfully in many areas of criminal justice, rather than just one.

Considering these three critical areas, then one can conclude that a reasonable expectation for the Center's future is that it will continue to grow and prosper.

THE CONSORTIUM

One of the goals of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium was to provide some medium for the exchange of knowledge among the affiliated institutions. Most of the institutions in the Consortium had a master's degree program in operation at the time the Consortium was established; all but one--Arizona State University--had an existing undergraduate program.

As the neophyte in the field of criminal justice, Arizona State University had the most to gain from membership in the Consortium. This relationship has been invaluable to ASU in several ways. First, because the University could draw upon the experience of the affiliated institutions in establishing

their programs, it was able to avoid many of the pitfalls attendant in the development of any academic program at whatever level. To resolve many of these problems would have resulted in wasted time; more importantly, however, they could have resulted in wasted money.

A second advantage to the Center of Criminal Justice at ASU has been that the affiliation with the Consortium has lent weight and credence to the Center's proposals, both with the University administration and the Board of Regents, as well as with the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council.

Thus, the quality of the criminal justice program at Arizona State University owes much to LEAA for making the Consortium possible and to the other members of the Consortium for sharing their experiences with the Center. The faculty and staff and students of the Center express their appreciation for having had the opportunity to share in this rewarding experience.

REFERENCES

- Hopkins, Ernest J., and Alfred Thomas, Jr. The Arizona State University Story. Phoenix, Arizona: Southwest Publishing, 1960.
- Lewin, Kurt. Resolving Social Conflicts. New York: Harper & Row, 1948.

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
PROGRAM HISTORY

By
James W. Fox

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this section of Volume I is to review the history of the 405(e) National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium grant at Eastern Kentucky University. This section is organized into six subsections, each of which views the development of the criminal justice program at Eastern Kentucky University from a different point of view. We are, as it were, turning the program around and looking at it from different perspectives. The first of these perspectives focuses upon the "Significant Phases" of the grant, and material is developed in this subsection in a chronological order. The second perspective, the "Major Forces," focuses upon those forces which have provided the impetus and direction through the various phases of development discussed earlier. The third perspective deals with the "Impact of Personnel" most directly

involved with the Center upon the program. The fourth perspective is that of the "Students" whom the program has been intended to serve and who, through their involvement, have influenced the strength and direction of the program. We then turn to the "Objectives" of the grant and view the historical development from the perspective of the objectives outlined in the grant itself. The sixth perspective addresses the "Monitoring and Evaluation" of the project. A "Summary" of these six perspectives is provided in a concluding subsection.

I. SIGNIFICANT PHASES

This subsection takes a chronological approach to the analysis of the 406(e) Criminal Justice Educational Consortium grant at Eastern Kentucky University. It focuses upon six phases, the first of which is the period of the activity leading up to the award of the grant. The other five phases represent the development of the program at Eastern Kentucky University. The six phases include the following:

- A. Pre-grant period
- B. Planning phase
- C. Organizational phase
- D. Implementation phase
- E. Program phase
- F. Evaluation phase

It was felt that this developmental approach to the first subsection would provide more easily perceived nodes of information about the program which would aid the development of the following subsections.

A. PRE-GRANT PERIOD

In 1971, Eastern Kentucky University was notified of an anticipated grant by LEAA to support "Centers of Excellence" for the furtherance of criminal justice graduate education. The University received guidelines for this proposal from Mr. William Caldwell of the Office of Educational Development in LEAA. The Vice President for Research and Development

reviewed the guidelines with the Dean of the School of Law Enforcement. An analysis of the University's ability to meet the criteria implicit in the guidelines was conducted. As a result of this evaluation, a proposal for a grant under the Centers of Excellence program was submitted in 1971.

During the next two years, the University received little or no official notice regarding the consideration of the proposal. Early in 1973, the University was notified that the Centers of Excellence program had been revised and that we would be considered for the Criminal Justice Educational Consortium program. Shortly thereafter representatives of LEAA visited Eastern Kentucky University and conducted a thorough investigation of the criminal justice educational program at Eastern Kentucky University. As a result of their report, Eastern Kentucky University was awarded the grant to commence July 1, 1973.

D. PLANNING PHASE

Planning for the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center which was established by the grant involved faculty, administrators of the University, members of the staff of the Center as they were employed, faculty and administrators at other Consortium schools, and various LEAA administrators and staff. The first task was to determine the present stage of development of the graduate program in the School of Law Enforcement at Eastern Kentucky University. This necessitated a candid analysis of curriculum, faculty and staff

personnel, and students, in addition to an evaluation of the level of teaching and research.

The result of this activity was a realization that the University and the School of Law Enforcement had an excellent undergraduate law enforcement program which had been providing well-prepared law enforcement personnel for agencies throughout the country. This program had two areas of specialization--police and corrections. In addition, the School of Law Enforcement offered four areas of specialization at the master's degree level:

1. Criminal Justice Education
2. Law Enforcement and Police Administration
3. Criminology and Corrections
4. Juvenile Delinquency

Nine courses, other than thesis, were offered at the graduate level in criminal justice. Faculty members, burdened by heavy thesis advising loads in addition to twelve-hour teaching loads, were not involved in research. In fact, the University computer services had little orientation to faculty research needs, and the library needed extensive additions to its holdings in the area of criminal justice and related subjects.

Students at the graduate level were required to attain a minimum of 600 on the GRE and a 2.4 undergraduate grade point average. Despite these minimum standards, many students had excellent academic credentials. The mean GRE for the M.S.

graduates was 847 in 1973 and the UGPA mean was 2.93 (N=38). This diversity in the student population created difficulties for the graduate faculty members as they attempted to organize and present their course materials. The thesis requirement created dissension among the students and faculty alike; students were dependent upon an inadequate research methodology course in another discipline for their preparation.

However, the analysis of the law enforcement program at this point revealed that the University administration was ready and eager to meet the needs of an expanding law enforcement program. The faculty demonstrated an eagerness to become involved in research and to expand curricular offerings, and students appeared to be cautiously awaiting enrichment of a graduate program. Facilities, while inadequate at the time, were being planned to provide new and more serviceable space for both the undergraduate and graduate criminal justice programs. Both the library and computer services indicated a willingness to expand according to the needs of the graduate program as analyzed in this phase. In short, the analysis indicated that fulfillment of the objectives of the Educational Consortium grant would require significant changes in various phases of the program at Eastern Kentucky University. Nevertheless, the conditions for these changes were excellent, and the opportunity for the program to flourish appeared to be rich indeed.

The next task was to design the "Program for Change."

This design included the following:

1. Expansion of curriculum
2. Encouragement of faculty research
3. Expansion of computer services
4. Expansion of library holdings
5. Reorganization of thesis advising system
6. Provision of broader advisory services for students
7. Continued planning for new facilities
8. Development of joint doctoral programs

Various alternatives for expanding the curriculum were explored. Consideration was given to the possibility of conducting a series of "Curriculum Design Seminars." However, it was realized that the specific foci of the seminar participants would be the element of greatest importance in this procedure, and that these foci would necessarily be the personal academic experience of the participants themselves. Thus, the result of such a seminar would either be a replication of some program already in existence or, worse yet, an ungainly meshing of many programs. The advantage of such a procedure would be that "experts" would have an opportunity to provide input and, therefore, hopefully would support the program.

A second alternative was considered, that of surveying the offerings of the fine universities both within and outside the Consortium to the end that compatible curricular

offerings would be adapted to our program. It was felt that this alternative would limit the potential scope, depth, and innovativeness of our curriculum. However, it was recognized that this was a less expensive and certainly not unusual means of curriculum expansion. Other alternatives considered included the following: a curriculum built from contemporary criminal justice textbooks; or a curriculum built from courses which our present faculty found to be most within their interests and capabilities, or courses developed from the "needs of the practitioner" expressed through surveys. It was felt that these alternatives were limited by the "status quo" although the characteristics of each focus might differ. Of course, in each case the procedure would have been defensible from the point of view that it was in extensive use.

Each of the above alternatives had an advocate in our faculty. This was also a concern lest the process become a source of division among our faculty. It was decided that the choice of alternatives would be made by the Acting Dean of the College of Law Enforcement, Dr. Truett Ricks, and the Coordinator of the Center, Dr. James Fox, with the advice and consultation of experts within the University, within the Consortium, and in other institutions and agencies of law enforcement.

The following plan was adopted: 1) to explore the broad theoretical horizon of criminal justice as a field of study; 2) to identify "core" conceptual sets; 3) to examine

potential areas of specialization within the field; and 4) to select for specialization at Eastern Kentucky University those areas which were a) within our capabilities and b) unique enough to establish the institution's curriculum as one with special competencies. The Coordinator of the Center was assigned the responsibility for implementing this plan.

The second element in the "Program for Change" was the encouragement of faculty research. Faculty research was recognized as very likely the most important element in the development of a doctoral program. The assumption was, and is today, that the unique characteristic of a doctoral level program is its relationship to the expanding parameters of knowledge and that faculty research is on the frontier of that expansion. A doctoral program which is limited to the mere "integration of present knowledge" is in essence no more than an expanded master's program. Therefore, the faculty research element would be of major importance to our program.

Planning for this element also involved the consideration of a variety of alternatives. Consideration was given to the possibility of hiring a "productive" faculty. However, in view of the present state of development of research facilities with which we were faced at the time and the relative competitive position of Eastern Kentucky University, it was concluded that this was not a promising alternative. It may be an alternative we would expect to implement at another stage in our development. Another possibility was the employment of

"retiring giants," that is, recognized authorities who were retiring from their present positions, in the hopes that they would attract productive young faculty. However, it was quickly realized that we had little agreement as to who the "retiring giants" were, and few of those that could be agreed upon were available. Therefore, though this alternative remains to be considered at another stage in our development, it was rejected for the time being.

The alternative finally agreed upon was to use the monies provided by the Educational Consortium grant to provide "mini-grants" for presently employed faculty to do research which was compatible with both the instructional thrust in our curriculum and the interests of the faculty. The implementation of this element was also made the responsibility of the Center Coordinator.

The third element in the "Program for Change," the expansion of computer services, involved: a) immediately making available computer services which were compatible with the research projects of the faculty and staff, and b) the development of a more comprehensive computer service capability. The first task was met by contracting with the University of Kentucky for computer services to be used by our faculty and staff. This made an excellent research facility immediately available to our faculty and staff; however, the facility is approximately 30 miles from our University. It was also decided that we should attempt to upgrade the computer services

presently available at Eastern Kentucky University. A research associate, Mr. Bruce Lewis, was assigned this responsibility and was charged with coordinating his efforts with those of Dr. Robert Ullman, the Research Director of the Center.

The fourth element in the "Program for Change" was the expansion of library holdings. The alternatives examined included duplication of library holdings at other institutions, obtaining of books recommended by the present faculty, purchase of extensive audiovisual material, and emphasis upon current periodical literature, as well as the establishment of a "satellite library" in the new Law Enforcement building. The conclusion of the deliberations on this topic was to combine as many of these alternatives as possible within our fiscal capabilities. Dr. Vernon Stubblefield, a faculty member of the College of Law Enforcement, was assigned the responsibility of implementing this plan.

The reorganization of the thesis advising system was the fifth element in the "Program for Change." A series of alternatives was considered, ranging from eliminating the thesis entirely, through reducing the thesis to a "college project," to a thesis advisory program which would enable the faculty to give each thesis the appropriate time and professional attention and thus improve the quality of thesis research. Students, faculty, Center staff, Consortium colleagues, and other professionals provided input on this topic. It was interesting to observe that each participant was limited to his own

experience with the thesis. The result was that strongly contradictory points of view emerged. Thus, students required to face the prospect of a thesis without any research methodology courses were frightened, frustrated, and antagonistic; faculty assigned to advise theses produced by these ill-prepared students, with no released time for the assignment, were equally frustrated and antagonistic; professionals from other institutions who had faced this problem and had found that the thesis requirement scared students away from their institutions encouraged the elimination of the thesis on their campuses as well as ours. Other respected faculty and colleagues in the Consortium viewed the thesis as an important academic experience during which they had seen students develop a level of professionalism otherwise unrealized. After considerable discussion, it was decided to attempt to provide adequate time for faculty to devote to thesis advising. In addition, it was decided to provide a research methodology course at the graduate level, with appropriate statistical courses, and to provide a research advisory service through the Center. Dr. Richard Snarr, Graduate Coordinator for the College of Law Enforcement, was assigned the responsibility of the thesis advisory scheduling, and Dr. Robert Ullman, Research Director of the Center, was assigned the responsibility of designing a research methodology course and appropriate statistical courses. Dr. Ullman, with the assistance of Mr. Lewis, also was given the responsibility of developing a research advisory service

within the Center. It was noted that this research advisory service should be available to faculty as well as to students.

Similar to this research advisory service was the provision of broader advisory services for students, the sixth element in the "Program for Change." Professional growth on the part of our students was viewed as entailing many aspects of personal development in addition to research capabilities. An appropriate program would necessarily provide assistance on a broader base, including academic counseling. Therefore, the Center was established as an advisory service wherein each staff member was to make himself available to assist students as necessary in their personal and professional development by personal counseling, by related tutorials, by general academic advising, and by general involvement. Particular attention was to be given to those students selected for graduate assistantships or graduate fellowships. The responsibility for the implementation of this plan was assumed by Dr. Truett Ricks, the Director of the Center.

The seventh element of the "Program for Change," the continuation of planning for new facilities, focused primarily upon the plans for a new six-million-dollar building. Since plans for the building had been well under way prior to the awarding of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium grant, only limited alterations were possible; however, planning for these alterations involved the participation of those supervisors whose departments would be utilizing the

space. The coordination of this activity was the responsibility of Dr. Ricks, then Acting Dean of the College of Law Enforcement, until the return of the Dean of the College of Law Enforcement in July 1974.

The eighth element in the "Program for Change," the development of the joint doctoral programs, required the implementation of several of the foregoing elements. That is, it was necessary to have developed a viable curriculum, research capabilities, library holdings, and faculty-student advisory system, and to have planned for appropriate facilities before planning joint doctoral programs. Consequently this element of planning was delayed several months. This is not to say that contact with other institutions was postponed. Indeed, discussions with representatives of the University of Kentucky began immediately upon receipt of the grant and have proceeded throughout the grant. However, the planning of the elements of the joint doctoral program and the characteristics, both academic and administrative, of the program required that Eastern Kentucky University place itself and its program in the position of being able to offer compatible programming. Several alternative joint doctoral arrangements were considered, including the following: 1) "tripartite" joint doctorates among the University of Louisville, the University of Kentucky, and Eastern Kentucky University, 2) a joint doctorate with the College of Social Professions at the University of Kentucky, 3) a joint doctorate with the College of Education at the

University of Kentucky, 4) a joint doctorate with the School of Police Administration at the University of Louisville, 5) a joint doctorate with the University of Maryland, 6) a joint doctorate with Michigan State University, 7) a joint doctorate with Northeastern University, and 8) a joint doctorate with Indiana University. The viability of each plan, as well as its academic and political advisability, was extensively examined. First priority was placed upon an effort to establish a joint doctoral arrangement with the College of Social Professions at the University of Kentucky. Of next priority was the possibility of a tripartite arrangement. The third priority was the joint doctorate with the University of Louisville. The joint doctorate with the College of Education at the University of Kentucky was considered an alternative which could meet the needs of many of our students; however, it was not viewed as a criminal justice doctorate and, thus, failed to meet what we had set as our objective. The joint doctorate with the Consortium schools at the University of Maryland, Michigan State University, and Northeastern University presented excellent academic possibilities for our students, enabling them to plan excellent programs and to be exposed to some of the finest faculty in the country. However, the distance between the cooperating schools and the complexity of administering long-distance, cooperative doctoral programs were serious handicaps to these programs. Moreover, the focus upon forensic science at Northeastern appeared to limit the area

of specialization for our doctoral candidates. All of these administrative difficulties were applicable to the possibility of a joint doctorate with Indiana University, in addition to the fact that Indiana University was not part of the Consortium and had no natural ties with Eastern Kentucky University.

The planning activities for the joint doctorate proceeded among the administrators at each institution as opportunity presented itself. However, it was decided not to attempt a contact with the administration at Indiana University at that time. It was the plan that the possibility of the joint doctorate would be posed to the administration of the institution and that the potential for the specific cooperative arrangement would be explored to identify the advantages to each institution and to the students and faculties of each. Curricular considerations were to follow. When the foregoing steps were completed, the problem of administrative coordination was to be examined. This was to be followed by the coordinated design of a statement of authorization to be completed by all necessary administrative personnel at each institution. It was hoped that the first student to enter a cooperative doctoral program would begin in September 1974. The responsibility for the implementation of the joint doctorate fell to the Director of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center.

The planning for the joint doctoral programs, the eighth element of the "Program for Change," was conducted simultaneously with the planning for 1) manpower research for the

region, and 2) faculty-student exchange. Research in related areas was viewed at Eastern Kentucky University as an integral part of our effort to enrich our program under the "Program for Change."

Planning for manpower research was assigned to the Research Director, Dr. Ullman, as his primary responsibility. A comprehensive survey was to be conducted of agencies capable of employing Criminal Justice graduates, both at the master's and the doctoral levels. It was felt that planning for the faculty-student exchange would be dependent largely upon the success of the "Program for Change," particularly the upgrading of faculty and the provision for curricular expansion. Moreover, this aspect of the grant program necessarily involved Consortium-wide coordination. However, preliminary planning at Eastern Kentucky University involved investigating the level of interest on the part of our faculty and students for participation in such a program and reviewing the administrative procedures necessary in such an exchange. The University administration indicated its full support for the grant and for this particular aspect of the grant by providing a flexible set of procedures to operationalize the program. This set of procedures was forwarded to the Consortium Coordinator. The Director of the Center, in cooperation with the Dean of the College, was to implement this element.

C. ORGANIZATIONAL PHASE

The organizational phase of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center activity was a continually evolving phase which commenced with the awarding of the grant and has proceeded throughout the life of the grant. As the above comments have indicated, the planning phase frequently touched upon specific assignments of individuals, thus structuring the organization of the Center and locating the Center organizationally within the College of Law Enforcement.

The first dimension of the organizational phase was to employ the staff authorized by the grant. This necessitated a nationwide search for qualified personnel. The Director of the Center, who was serving as Acting Dean, had the primary responsibility for this dimension. In October of 1973, he interviewed Dr. James Fox who agreed to accept employment as Coordinator of the Center, commencing December 1, 1973. At that time, Dr. Fox was asked to participate in the review of candidates and selection of other staff. The curriculum Coordinator, Dr. Donald Skinner, was employed to begin November 1, 1973, and the Research Director, Dr. Robert Ullman, was employed to begin January 1, 1974. The Dean of the College, Robert W. Posey, who was at that time on leave of absence, reviewed these recommendations and concurred. This procedure, including nationwide search, interviewing, selection, and employment of key personnel for the Center took the first six months of the grant period. It is felt that this represented a serious delay in the implementation of the grant.

The organization of the office for the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center, including the provision of facilities and purchasing of equipment, was completed early in this period. The secretary to the Director was employed as early as August of 1973. There was minimal delay in the operationalization of this aspect of the organizational phase.

During this six-month period, July 1, 1973, through December 31, 1973, much of the responsibility for the operation of the Center was shared by the Graduate Coordinator of the College of Law Enforcement, Dr. Richard Snarr, and Dr. Truett Ricks, Director of the Center. These gentlemen were in constant consultation with the Dean of the College, Mr. Posey, who was on leave of absence, the staff who had been selected but not yet employed, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. John P. Rowlett, and the LEAA Program Manager, Mr. Norval Jespersen. The assistance of these men was invaluable during this period.

The second dimension of the organizational phase commenced in January 1974, with the active participation of the key Center staff--Dr. Ricks, Dr. Fox, Dr. Skinner, and Dr. Ullman. During this period, these staff members were made familiar with the objectives of the project and their particular relationships to those objectives. Specific assignments were made consistent with the areas outlined in the planning phase. Additional secretarial staff were employed.

During the third quarter of the grant, a comprehensive review of the budget for the grant was conducted, and a determination was made that additional staff would be necessary as provided for by the budget document. A search for these staff members was initiated and the Assistant Research Director, Mr. Bruce Lewis, was employed in June 1974, to begin September 1974. The role for the Graduate Curriculum Coordinator was redesigned, in view of what was felt to be an overlap of responsibilities with a concomitant neglect of other areas of responsibility. It was decided to employ a staff member who would be assigned responsibility for academic innovation and who could work closely with the graduate students in the role of academic advisor. In this way, the curricular programs would be better articulated to the student body. A nationwide search to fill this position was initiated, and Dr. David Williams was employed to commence September 1, 1974.

The third dimension of this organizational phase was the defining of relationships within the Center and between the Center and the School of Law Enforcement. It was determined by the Director that the Coordinator would have primary responsibility for the administration of the Center and that he would report to the Director, who was the Acting Dean of the School of Law Enforcement. The Curriculum Coordinator, the Graduate Coordinator, and the Research Director would be directly responsible to the Coordinator and, through him, to the Director of the Center. The Assistant Director of Research

would be responsible to the Director of Research and, through him, to the Coordinator and the Director of the Center. No administrative decisions would be finalized, however, without the specific approval of the Director. This increased responsibility on the part of the Coordinator was necessitated by the increased responsibilities upon the Director, Dr. Ricks, due to his assignment as Acting Dean of the School of Law Enforcement. Dr. Ricks served one-half time as Director of the Center and one-half time as Acting Dean of the School.

While the Dean of the School of Law Enforcement was on leave of absence and the Director of the project was Acting Dean, the coordination between the Center and the School of Law Enforcement was naturally eased. Throughout this period, staff members from the Center were active participants in faculty meetings of the School of Law Enforcement, and all planning and project activities of the Center necessarily involved the Acting Dean.

A major organizational change in the university took place July 1, 1974. The School of Law Enforcement, which organizationally had been under the College of Applied Arts and Technology, was upgraded to the status of a College. Dean Posey, who had been previously responsible to the Dean of Applied Arts and Technology, henceforth reported directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs of the University. An additional development at this point was the awarding of faculty status for the qualified staff members of the Center. Dr. Ricks,

Dr. Fox, Dr. Ullman, and Dr. Skinner were appointed Professors of Law Enforcement. Dr. Williams was appointed Assistant Professor of Law Enforcement. The appointment of Mr. Lewis as Instructor of Law Enforcement took place one year later, in September 1975.

The Dean of the College returned to the campus in August 1974 and proceeded to implement an operational procedure he had followed prior to his leave of absence; that is, to work closely with Dr. Ricks, who returned to his position as Associate Dean in the administration of the College. Thus, the organizational relationship between the College and the Center was maintained.

An important change in the organization of the Center resulted when the Director, Dr. Ricks, was appointed Commissioner of State Police for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Dr. Fox, the Coordinator, was appointed Director and Coordinator of the Center, responsible to the Dean of the College. Every effort was made to maintain existing organizational relationships within the Center.

At approximately the same time as this reassignment, a reorganization of the College was instituted. The College was organized into three academic departments--Police Administration, Correctional Services, and the Traffic Safety Institute--and the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center. The administrator in charge of each subdivision of the College reported directly to the Dean, and periodic meetings of the "Department

Heads," including the four administrators, commenced. In this way, the 406(e) grant project, represented by the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center, was integrated into the operational organization of the College of Law Enforcement.

Coordination between the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center, the 406(e) grant project, and other administrative elements of the University was provided through the office of the Dean of the College of Law Enforcement. In this way, administrative activities were followed which were consistent with the procedures of the College and the University.

During the spring of 1975, as a result of the increased responsibilities upon Dr. Ullman as Chairman of the Manpower Research project for the entire Consortium, it became apparent that an additional staff member would be necessary. The need was aggravated by the loss of Dr. Ricks from the project and the increased workload upon the staff members. At this point, a nationwide search for candidates for faculty positions was being conducted by the Dean of the College, and recommendations were solicited from staff and faculty. One of the applicants, Mr. Daniel Moser, was employed to serve as a Research Associate commencing June 1, 1975. Mr. Moser was to be directly responsible to the Research Director and, through him, to the Director of the Center. Mr. Moser's primary responsibility was to be the completion of the manpower research project for Region IV. He was also to serve as a research advisor in the research advisory service program of the Center.

D. IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

The discussions of the implementation phase will follow the same general format as the discussions of the planning phase. This discussion will include the following: 1) the "Program for Change," 2) the manpower study, and 3) the faculty-student exchange. In this way the reader may relate the implementation phase to the planning phase with an awareness of the various stages of organizational development discussed above.

The first of the eight elements of the "Program for Change" was the expansion of the curriculum. It had been decided that the curriculum would focus upon the major areas of the criminal justice system within our academic capabilities, with the proviso that a "core" applicable to the broad area of criminal justice would be included.

The development of a master's degree option in forensic science was initiated on April 4, 1974, with the establishment of a committee to formulate the required curricula. The committee assignments made by Dr. Truett Ricks, then Acting Dean of the College of Law Enforcement, were Dr. Donald Skinner (chairman), Dr. Robert Fraas, Dr. Vernon Stubblefield, and Dr. Richard Snarr, all of the School of Law Enforcement. At the time of organizing this committee, Dr. Stubblefield had taught criminalistics in the School of Law Enforcement for the previous three years. Dr. Fraas had been employed by the College, funded by the Kentucky Crime Commission, to develop the

criminalistics associate degree program and the forensic science bachelor's degree program.

The committee, utilizing the results of two surveys conducted by Dr. Skinner and materials collected from universities and associations, began consideration of the master's curriculum in forensic science. The study conducted by Dr. Skinner had surveyed fourteen states, the eight in LEAA Region IV and six states contiguous to Kentucky. One phase involved a survey of educational institutions, and a second phase was a survey of sheriffs and police chiefs in counties and cities of over 25,000 population. The tentative draft of a master's program being developed by the Southern Association of Forensic Scientists was also a valuable acquisition.

In the very early planning of the undergraduate forensic science program at Eastern Kentucky University, Dr. Stubblefield had visited several universities and the FBI laboratories and had achieved a good working relationship with the State Police Crime Laboratory in Frankfort. More recently, in the development of the undergraduate program, Dr. Fraas had been visiting universities and crime laboratories, attending conferences and workshops, talking with equipment manufacturers, and submitting construction change orders in the forensic laboratories included as part of the new College of Law Enforcement building under construction. (At this time the School had been reorganized into a "College".) These individuals brought a wealth of expertise to the committee's graduate

curriculum discussions. As Dr. Stubblefield and Dr. Fraas also were to be the initial instructors who would be responsible for the quality of these degree programs and who would be teaching the criminalistics and forensic science courses, they had a personal interest in the courses being discussed.

In effect, Dr. Fraas and Dr. Stubblefield brought to the committee their experience obtained in developing the undergraduate program and their scientific expertise; Dr. Skinner, the research materials on need and existing educational programs in the United States; and Dr. Snarr, a graduate program coordinating function.

Utilizing the experiences of Dr. Fraas and Dr. Stubblefield and the research information developed by Dr. Skinner, the committee worked through several drafts of the master's option curriculum. An out-of-state consultant brought to the campus to review the proposed undergraduate degree programs also reviewed the proposed graduate program. Based on his recommendations, a final proposed graduate program was developed for submission to the proper University committees in the fall of 1975. The committee recommended to the Dean of the College that submission of the graduate program should follow University approval of the undergraduate program--which was accomplished in the spring semester of 1974.

The implementation of a master's degree option in forensic sciences and a master's degree option in court administration, which was submitted to the University Academic Council in the

spring of 1975, provides a breadth to the College of Law Enforcement master's degree program heretofore lacking.

Discussions of curricular areas to be included in the expansion were conducted with faculty, administrators, and students in the College (then School) of Law Enforcement. Opinions of outstanding criminal justice educators in the Consortium were also solicited and proved to be especially valuable. Other opinions of experts both within and outside of criminal justice education were solicited. The Coordinator finally recommended that we focus upon a research component, an applied social theory component, a forensic science component, and a few advanced courses supporting those already in the curriculum. Dr. Ullman was requested to develop appropriate courses for the research component and submit them to the Coordinator; Dr. Fox assumed the responsibility for the applied social theory component; Dr. Stubblefield, a criminalistics specialist, was requested to develop the forensic science component; and Dr. Snarr was requested to provide the appropriate courses at the advanced level. It should be noted that this expansion represented a 175 percent increase in graduate curricular offerings in the College of Law Enforcement (then School) at Eastern Kentucky University.

The proposed listing of courses was submitted to the Law Enforcement curriculum committee and was approved by them with no change. The proposal was then submitted to the Graduate Council of the University and was approved without change.

Before the proposal was submitted to the Council, extensive discussions took place with representatives of the Departments of Sociology, Political Science, Psychology, Economics, and Education. In these discussions Dr. Fox presented the purposes of the additional courses and the relationship between these courses and both present and future curricular offerings of those departments. It was emphasized that the departments were being asked to provide "foundation courses" to support the additional offerings in the College of Law Enforcement. Some departments felt that all "applied social theory" courses should be offered by one of the social science departments, but as a result of these discussions it was realized that additional courses, more appropriately within the purview of the social science departments, would be necessary and that the application of these foundation courses to criminal justice should remain within the College of Law Enforcement. The University Academic Council then reviewed the proposal and approved it. This represents final approval on the Eastern Kentucky University campus.

One aspect of the curriculum development which affected the undergraduate program was the addition of a basic statistics course which would be a prerequisite for statistics at the graduate level. This course was designed under Dr. Ullman's supervision, submitted through the appropriate committees, and approved for inclusion in the undergraduate curriculum.

An interesting aspect of the implementation of criminal justice curriculum offerings is the effect these offerings have had upon the entire institution. As has been pointed out, these offerings resulted in an additional course in the undergraduate law enforcement program. In addition, courses presently offered in the undergraduate program felt the impact of an enriched graduate program, and course content in the undergraduate program was also enriched to prepare the student for the possibility of continued academic growth. Moreover, departments in other colleges within the University were urged to add to the curriculum and expand the coverage of the present courses to meet the needs of our graduate students. In short, the effect of these changes has been felt throughout the University.

The mini-grant approach to the encouragement of faculty research was implemented in two areas: 1) comparative criminal justice systems in developing countries, and 2) criminal justice systems research in the United States. Support was provided for a research project relating to criminal justice systems in East Africa, under the direction of Dr. Robert Insko and a research project on the criminal justice system of Thailand, under the direction of Dr. Richard Snarr. Support was also provided for a research project entitled: "Value Structures of Personnel within the Criminal Justice System in Kentucky." In addition, support was provided for a simulated jury study, a project related to food service administration in

correctional institutions, and a project on search and seizure policies in schools in Ohio.

Outside support was sought for various other research projects, including a nationwide college-student-victimization study, an international criminal justice study, a study of the adaptability of human relations training as treatment modality, a study of the use of canine forces for routine municipal patrol, and an instructional competency project.

Effective September 1974, the prospective director of each mini-project was expected to submit a proposal similar in design to that required by the National Institute of Law Enforcement. The proposals were reviewed by the Coordinator and the Research Director of the Center and the Graduate Coordinator of the College of Law Enforcement. When a proposal was accepted, a budget for the project was approved, a separate account was set up, and the director of the project was assigned part-time to the Center, responsible to the Coordinator. When the project was completed, any money in the account was returned to the 406(e) account. Thus, no budget could overspend.

The expansion of computer services, the third element of the "Program for Change," was the responsibility of the Assistant Director of Research for the Center. However, the Coordinator assumed the responsibility of establishing and implementing the arrangement with the University of Kentucky computer services. These services were used extensively in the early stages of the National Criminal Justice Educational

Consortium project. Mr. Lewis, the Research Associate, met frequently with the personnel of the Eastern Kentucky University Computer Service office to design an expanded computer service capability. His primary focus was upon the provision of nonparametric computer programs for criminal justice research; however, his activities extended beyond this to include additional parametric programming and, in fact, recommendations for additional hardware. He and Dr. Ullman, the Research Director, served on the Eastern Kentucky University Academic Users Committee for computer services as well as the statewide academic computer services users committee. Dr. Ullman also served as a member of the computer services committee for the University. In these roles, personnel of the Center have been actively involved in the expansion and enrichment of the computer services for the University and particularly the application of these services to the criminal justice program.

Dr. Stubblefield, who was responsible for the expansion of the library holdings, actively sought input from all sources. The University supported this effort with a funding of \$40,000 for the purchase of additional library holdings for the College of Law Enforcement. The President of the University gave this support by indicating that, in the purchase of library holdings, special emphasis was to be placed upon the needs of the expanding graduate program in criminal justice. Provision was made, with President Martin's support, for a satellite library

in the new Law Enforcement building. Audiovisual Services were encouraged by the President to focus upon the needs of the graduate program in criminal justice, and separate funding was found to provide for the production of a film developed by a member of the College of Law Enforcement faculty in the area of practical municipal law enforcement. Also, additional audiovisual services have been made available to our faculty and Center personnel for the development of additional visual aids.

The reorganization of the thesis advising system, element four of the "Program for Change," was the responsibility of Dr. Richard Snarr. Dr. Snarr sought the aid of the administration of the University to provide "thesis credit" for faculty to enable them to reduce their course load to provide time for thesis advising. Provision for this was made by the administration, and limited released time was provided. The reorganization of this area was supported by the curricular offerings in the research component. Support was also found in the research advisory service provided by the Center. In addition, a general format for thesis writing was borrowed from Michigan State University, through the cooperation of Dr. John McNamara, and distributed among students and faculty advisors. A special project was implemented to review all theses previously written at Eastern Kentucky University to determine particular areas of concern relative to research writing. The findings of this project were submitted to Dr. Snarr and to the research advisory service personnel, as well as to the instructors of the research methodology courses.

The provision of advisory services for students, element six, was the shared responsibility of all staff members of the Center. Dr. Williams, Graduate Curriculum Development Coordinator, had this area as his primary focus under the Project Director; however, each staff member was involved in personal and career counseling, as well as academic advising, for graduate students. Dr. Skinner, Dr. Fox, and Dr. Ullman had had extensive training and experience in this area, and Dr. Williams had had excellent training and limited, but valuable, experience. The activity of the Center staff in these areas frequently resulted in staff discussions of particular student problems which led to positive efforts to assist and/or advise students. Dr. Williams' close relationship with the graduate students served well to enhance and develop this element of our "Program for Change."

As I have indicated above, the preparations for the Law Enforcement building, element seven of the "Program for Change," were well under way by the time the Center was fully staffed. However, the Coordinator and the Director of the Center were actively involved with the College of Law Enforcement faculty member who had been assigned the responsibility of completing these preparations. These gentlemen met with architects and personnel from the Business Office of the University who were responsible for equipping the building. In addition, Dr. Stubblefield and Dr. Fraas were encouraged to participate in these discussions as they applied to criminalistics facilities

and equipment. As a result of these discussions, certain important changes were made in the design of the building, the provision of facilities, the provision of equipment, and the assignment of space. As frequently happens in the design of academic buildings, it was impossible for the building program to meet all of the desired requirements. Nevertheless, participation by these staff members and the desire of the administration to provide the best facility possible led to significant changes which we feel will have an impact upon the criminal justice program in the future.

The development of the joint doctoral program, element eight of the "Program for Change," was the subject of a speech delivered by Dr. Fox to the Board of Directors of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium on February 27, 1975. As we have indicated in the discussion of planning, the first priority was to establish a joint doctorate with the School of Social Professions at the University of Kentucky. To this end, discussions were held with faculty and administrators from the University of Kentucky throughout the life of the grant. A minimum of ten Eastern Kentucky University administrators and faculty met on different occasions for varying periods of time with personnel from the University of Kentucky. The total number of man-hours in these discussions alone amounted to well over 160. Eastern Kentucky University personnel included the President of the University, the Vice President of the University, the Graduate Dean, the Dean of the College of Law

Enforcement, the Dean of the College of Applied Arts and Technology, the Director of the Center, the Coordinator of the Center, the Curriculum Coordinator of the Center, the Graduate Coordinator for the College of Law Enforcement, and other faculty. The University of Kentucky personnel included the Academic Vice President, the Dean of the College of Social Professions, and approximately six faculty members. In spite of these efforts and the expenditure of man-hours by major administrative personnel, the joint doctorate with the College of Social Professions at the University of Kentucky did not materialize. It should be noted here, as was indicated in the speech to the Board of Directors of the Consortium, that the issues blocking the realization of this joint doctorate were not curricular issues, or even academic issues; they were in essence purely administrative issues.

These same administrative difficulties emanating from the University of Kentucky also frustrated efforts to implement a tripartite joint doctorate between the University of Kentucky, the University of Louisville, and Eastern Kentucky University, in spite of the support provided by the Governor of the Commonwealth and the State Crime Commission. In fact, the State Crime Commission funded the expenses incurred in the development of the tripartite doctorate, and the University of Louisville and Eastern Kentucky University were prepared for active participation in this effort. The failure of this effort was considered one of the major disappointments in the project since the

promise implicit in a tripartite arrangement such as this, which would have embodied the fullest utilization of the strength of each university, was very great indeed.

As a result of the failure to implement the first two priority joint doctoral programs, attention was then given to the possibility of a joint doctoral program with the University of Louisville. After many initial discussions, it was agreed with the University of Louisville administration and the faculty of the School of Police Administration that this would be a viable and mutually beneficial project. Again, numerous discussions were held, involving many of the same personnel from Eastern Kentucky University. These meetings resulted in the expenditure of approximately 80 man-hours and culminated in a formal written document specifying both the academic and administrative aspects of the program. This document was submitted to the Board of Regents of Eastern Kentucky University and approved by that body. In the spring of 1974, the document was submitted through appropriate channels at the University of Louisville preliminary to its submission to the Board of Regents. At some point during this procedure at the University of Louisville, the proposal was "tabled." In the summer of 1974, the Director of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center was informed by personnel at the University of Louisville that the "tabling" of the proposal was the result of a communiqué from the President of the University of Kentucky to the President of the University of Louisville, the content of which was as

yet unknown. In any case, the result of this action was to kill the possibility of the University of Louisville-Eastern Kentucky University joint doctorate in criminal justice in 1975.

As problems developed with the higher priority joint doctoral arrangements, it became obvious that it would be necessary to implement the lower priority joint doctoral arrangements. It should be noted that these arrangements were lower in priority only because of the distance between institutions and the potential administrative complexities, and not because of the lesser quality of the programs. The stature of the programs at the University of Maryland and Michigan State University was such that joint doctoral arrangements with these universities were quite desirable if distance and administrative complexities could be overcome. Initial contacts were made by Dr. Fox through the Directors of the Consortium grant projects at these two institutions. These initial contacts took place during the spring of 1974, following the failure to implement the tripartite agreement discussed earlier. The procedures followed in the implementation of these proposals were the same as those discussed above relative to the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville. The first issue was feasibility, the second issue was curriculum and academic criteria, and the third issue was administrative organization. The joint doctorate with the University of Maryland was the first to be approved by both institutions and the first student

CONTINUED

1 OF 4

Mr. J. R. Cummings, entered this program in September 1974. The joint doctorate with Michigan State University, because of the complexity of the administration at Michigan State University, took more time and the expenditure of more man-hours. However, one student was enrolled in this program in September 1975. (Unfortunately, personal financial difficulties for him and his family necessitated his withdrawal from the Michigan State program to take full-time employment with the Kentucky Department of Justice in September 1976.) No more than 20 man-hours of Eastern Kentucky University personnel were involved in the discussions with the University of Maryland personnel, and approximately 45 man-hours were involved in discussions with the personnel of Michigan State University. Of course, in each case extensive man-hours went into the preparation of documents and the overall design of each joint doctoral program. However, the cooperation of the personnel at these two institutions and the high quality of academic administrative sensitivities evidenced, particularly by Dr. Peter Lejins and Dr. John McNamara, enabled the institutions involved to develop a viable administrative system for these complex programs. In each case, the potential student participants visited the cooperating institution with the Coordinator of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center at Eastern Kentucky University. It is felt that this participation by the students focused attention upon the realistic issues of the proposed program and enabled faculty and administrative personnel to keep crucial issues before them.

Eastern Kentucky University has had a joint doctoral arrangement between the College of Education at Eastern Kentucky University and the College of Education at the University of Kentucky for several years. This arrangement served as a "springboard" for a joint doctoral arrangement between the College of Law Enforcement at Eastern Kentucky University and the College of Education at the University of Kentucky. This was not considered to be a criminal justice doctorate since the degree would be a doctorate in education with a specialization in criminal justice education. However, several of our students have criminal justice education as their educational objective, and the program is well designed to provide this type of education. Implementation of this program was not as complex as other joint doctorates, since many potential problems of the program had been resolved by the administrations of the College of Education at our institution and the College of Education at University of Kentucky, and our efforts were limited to implementing the program in terms of criminal justice education. In spite of these advantages, no less than 30 man-hours were expended by Eastern Kentucky University personnel in discussions with representatives of the University of Kentucky. One student was enrolled in this program in September 1974, and three more students were enrolled in September 1975.

Discussions with the personnel at Northeastern University began in December 1974 and continue to this date. However, the nature of the Northeastern doctorate and the present stage

of development of the Eastern Kentucky University forensic science component are such that the culmination of this joint doctorate may very well not be realized until after the grant period expires.

In view of the success of the joint doctoral arrangements previously discussed, it was not felt that it would be appropriate to explore a joint doctoral arrangement with Indiana University at this time.

The eight elements of the "Program for Change" embodied only one, though possibly the most important, dimension of the project's activities. A second dimension was the manpower research which was under the direction of Dr. Ullman. This area of responsibility will be more comprehensively covered in the third volume of these reports, the manpower research project. Briefly, for Region IV, Dr. Ullman and Mr. Lewis designed a manpower research study focusing upon manpower needs for graduates in criminal justice programs in the agencies and educational institutions throughout our region. These gentlemen designed a survey instrument and conducted this survey during the second year of the grant period. In addition, a survey of Eastern Kentucky University criminal justice graduates was conducted to determine career patterns.

As a result of Dr. Ullman's activities in this area, he was asked to assume the responsibility for a nationwide Consortium study of manpower needs which would involve the coordination of the survey efforts of the Consortium schools. The

design and questionnaire developed by Dr. Ullman for our region were of such high quality that they were adopted for use in this nationwide study and also adapted for use in an even wider study under another grant from the National Planning Association.

The faculty-student exchange program was not considered for implementation until the curriculum changes and the renovation of computer services had been completed at Eastern Kentucky University. The first type of faculty-student exchange considered was the joint doctoral program discussed above. This program involved the transfer of Eastern Kentucky University students to the cooperating institution and the participation of faculty members of Eastern Kentucky University on various doctoral committees of the cooperating institution. Other steps in the implementation of this program included a survey conducted in the spring of 1975 of student and faculty interest in participating in a one-for-one exchange at one or more institutions within the Consortium. However, the implementation of this program requires coordination of scheduling and housing which may very well delay the realization of the promise of this valuable dimension of the project until after September 1976.

E. PROGRAM PHASE

The courses added to the curriculum as a part of element one of the "Program for Change," the expansion of the curriculum

are listed in Table 1. Each of these courses has been taught at least once, and some have been taught more frequently. These include research methodology (five semesters), criminal justice planning and advanced statistics (three semesters each) and social ecology and the criminal justice system, social change and the criminal justice system, victimization, and multivariate analysis (two semesters each). The discussion of the relationship between these curricular offerings and the liberal arts curricula as well as other criminal justice courses was covered in Dr. Fox's speech presented to the Board of Directors of the Consortium.

The program for the encouragement of faculty research, element two of the "Program for Change," was primarily through the "mini-grants." Some of these projects met with success and some met with failure. Unfortunately, Dr. Insko, who was responsible for the comparative criminal justice project in East Africa, resigned halfway through the project. At that time it did not appear to be financially feasible to assign another staff member to that project since it could not have been picked up at the point at which Dr. Insko left. The first half of the project had encompassed the preparation of the faculty member (researcher) in terms of familiarity with the area of study (in this case, East Africa), familiarization with the criminal justice system of that country, familiarization with the language (Swahili was used in this case), and the solicitation of funds for travel. No funds were to be

Table 1

Courses Added to the Eastern Kentucky University
Graduate Criminal Justice Curriculum
as a Result of the 406(e) Project Efforts

<u>Course Number (CRJ)</u>	<u>Course Title</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Semesters Offered</u>
650	Seminar in Criminal Investigation	An overview of investigative techniques and criminalistics.	1
656	Legal and Ethical Issues in Corrections	An analysis of the impact of federal and state laws, court decisions, and moral and ethical issues in relation to treatment procedures.	1
657	Criminal Justice Planning	Overview of planning as a component of the criminal justice system.	3
660	Advanced Criminal Justice Administration	An analysis of structures characteristic of elements within the criminal justice system and interactional processes within each element.	1
663	Seminar in Public Law	Study in depth of selected problems in public law.	1
666	Law and the Juvenile System	A study of laws relevant to the juvenile justice system.	2
670	Theories of Criminology and Delinquency	Review of classical and current theories of criminology and delinquency.	2

Table 1 (cont.)

<u>Course Number (CRJ)</u>	<u>Course Title</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Semesters Offered</u>
675	Social Ecology and the Crimi- nal Justice Sys- tem	An analysis of time and space factors characteristic of the human environment in communities in the United States. Par- ticular attention given to the interaction be- tween ecological fac- tors and the criminal justice system.	2
677	Social Change and the Criminal Jus- tice System	Review of significant social changes in twen- tieth century America and the relation between these and the concepts implicit in law and the criminal justice system.	2
679	The Study of Victims	Comprehensive study of victimization.	2
683	Seminar on Crim- inal Justice Data	Study of data available; sources, limitations, advantages, and means of verifiability.	1
685	Advanced Statis- tics for Crimi- nal Justice Sys- tems	Parametric (linear and nonlinear) relationships. Distribution free (non- parametric) relationships.	3
686	Multivariate Analysis and Advanced Experi- mental Design	One- and two-way classi- fications, nesting, blocking, multiple cor- relations, incomplete designs, variance compo- nents, factorial analysis.	2

Table 1 (cont.)

<u>Course Number (CRJ)</u>	<u>Course Title</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Semesters Offered</u>
688	Research Method- ology in Crimi- nal Justice Sys- tems	Local, state, fed- eral, and interna- tional sources of information; obser- vational, rating and survey techniques, sociometrics; anecdotal records, behavioral measurement; longitu- dinal approaches; pro- posal writing; selec- tion of methodologies.	5
690	Topical Seminar in Criminal Jus- tice	May be repeated to a maximum of 12 hours on different topics.	1

used from the grant for foreign travel or per diem. All of these involved the extensive preparation of the researcher himself. When Dr. Insko resigned, he took with him this part of the project. Needless to say, this was a great disappointment to the Director of the Center as well as the Dean of the College and the President of the University.

The second international project, the Thailand project, was under the direction of Dr. Richard Snarr. The general design was very similar to the East Africa project in that the first half was devoted to the preparation of the researcher and the second half to the actual conduct of the project. Dr. Snarr designed the study to analyze normative value structures of law enforcement personnel in Thailand, one stage of which was the translation of the Rokeach Value Scale into Thai. The results of this study were then compared to the findings of a study conducted by Mr. Thomas Reed, which dealt with similar issues for Kentucky law enforcement personnel.

The analysis of the differential value perception within the Kentucky law enforcement system had been conducted by Mr. Reed in a series of studies, each of which took a separate subsystem for analysis (e.g., police, courts, etc.). Utilizing the Rokeach Value Questionnaire, each study surveyed a sample of a population of one of these subsystems. The subsystems were then compared in terms of compatible or conflicting value structures.

Search and seizure laws for public schools were analyzed by Dr. Robert Bagby, and a descriptive study of the state of the implementation of these laws by school personnel in the State of Ohio was conducted. School personnel were mailed questionnaires, and selected personnel were interviewed in this project.

During the first ten months of his employment at Eastern Kentucky University, Dr. Fox also served as director of a victimization study funded by the Virginia Division for Justice and Crime Prevention. This study involved an analysis of the comparative rates of victimization between University students and residents in the immediately surrounding community. That portion of the study was also used by Dr. Fox for a dissertation in sociology. In addition, the Center supported a further analysis of these victimization data with particular emphasis upon the college population and victimization characteristics.

Three conferences were also held as a result of the 406(e) project. These were conducted under the direction of one of the faculty of the College with the assistance of a member of the Center staff. Dr. Skinner, Curriculum Coordinator of the Center, actually took a major role in the Conference on Court Administration Curriculum, but was assisted by Mr. William Nixon of the Law Enforcement faculty. Dr. Bette Fox of the Law Enforcement faculty directed a conference entitled "Women in the Criminal Justice System," assisted by

Dr. Ullman of the Center. Another conference, on security and data systems in criminal justice, was conducted under the direction of Dr. Stuart Gilman and Mr. William Nixon, assisted by Dr. James Fox of the Center. Dr. Elizabeth Horn also conducted a conference on public school security problems. Finally, a particularly successful conference was presented under the direction of Dr. Shirley Snarr, the topic of which was Correctional Food Service Management.

The encouragement of faculty research through these studies and conferences was intended to focus faculty activity upon issues on the "frontier of criminal justice knowledge." In this way, the doctoral level programming would be oriented to the newly developing conceptual sets within criminal justice education. The mini-grants which have been utilized by the faculty were, it is felt, excellent examples of the use of this type approach. With one exception, the study by Dr. Insko, it is felt that this program was quite successful.

The expansion of computer services, element three of the "Program for Change," developed throughout the grant period. Initially, grant funds were used to pay for services provided by the University of Kentucky computer services office. All programming was done by Center personnel, primarily by Dr. Fox, but rental of the University of Kentucky computer tapes and the use of data processing equipment were charged against the grant. However, in January 1976, Eastern Kentucky University expanded the computer services on campus, including the

placement of three terminals and a key punch machine in the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center and a direct on-line capability to the two largest computers in the state. These steps were taken by the University as a direct result of the increased utilization of existing facilities by the faculty in criminal justice and at no expense to the grant.

The additional computer services that were developed with Mr. Lewis' assistance at Eastern Kentucky University were, as indicated earlier, primarily devoted to the development of non-parametric programs. These programs were finally operationalized during the second year of the grant period, and students and faculty alike made extensive use of them. This was of great significance for the graduate program in criminal justice since the data produced within the criminal justice system are primarily nonparametric data, necessitating procedures which were programmed by Mr. Lewis.

In addition to these activities, the University, with the advice of Dr. Ullman and Mr. Lewis and faculty of other departments, developed a comprehensive system of computer services. This system provides for terminals in the new law enforcement building which would have tie-in capabilities to the Kentucky state data processing system. Thus, the services of the personnel involved in the 406(e) grant provided direction and impetus for expanded data processing capabilities for the entire University and resulted in major expenditures of funds by the University in this area. The impact of these services

upon the academic growth of the graduate program in criminal justice and upon research in criminal justice which, in turn, provides an important service to the criminal justice system within our state and our region, is an excellent example of the chain of events set in motion by a successful LEAA grant program. This "chain of events" has not been completed. Very likely, as the value of expanded computer services is realized, more services will be made available and these will provide even more comprehensive and relevant services to the criminal justice system.

With the support of Dr. Martin, the President, Dr. Rowlett, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dean Posey, the Dean of the College, and the personnel in the library and in Audiovisual Services, it was possible to expand the "learning resources" of the University in the area of criminal justice education. This enabled students and faculty to do research and to develop "learning packages" which would have been otherwise impossible.

The reorganization of the thesis advising system, element five, was one of the most important developments in the program area. The Dean of the College was able to assign faculty to "thesis courses" and thus provide them with time to devote to the production of theses by our graduate students. The provision of a research methodology course and related statistics courses improved the level of production of research. These factors combined with the additional computer services

and provided a general stimulation of learning environment for students and faculty alike. Members of the Center staff served on from six to thirty-three graduate theses committees and chaired from two to eight committees. In addition, Dr. Fox and Dr. Ullman served as normember advisors to numerous committees, assisting students in the design of their studies. Center staff were not provided with released time for these activities and frequently devoted weekends and evenings to working with students and faculty in this area.

A comment might be made here regarding the interpersonal interactions resulting from the activities in this area. As a result of released time and increased levels of capability, faculty became more personally involved than they previously had been in the students' research. This increased involvement also increased the level of personal commitment by the faculty. On occasion, the participation of Center staff resulted in the questioning of methodological procedures which became a source of confrontation between the faculty member and the Center staff member. In this way, academic stimulation is a "two-edged sword," cutting in one direction to provide for an exciting academic environment and in another direction to provide for the confrontation of methodological issues. These are the very characteristics which are found on the finest and most productive campuses and, although methodological issues are difficult to resolve, it was felt that the stimulating climate was well worth the problems incurred.

The provision of advisory services by the Center staff, element six, added a personal dimension to the grant project. Center staff members counseled graduate students in problems relating to marital relations, career planning, and family relations, as well as academic problems. Frequently in-service students were involved in issues of the application of professional ethics and sought consultation from Center staff. Again, the chain of events set loose by the award of the grant extended beyond the scope of simply writing programs and into a total involvement with individuals and, through them, a significant relationship with the criminal justice system in our state and region. This is particularly true for the students who were employed in the police departments of major cities in our region, those employed in state planning agencies, and those working for crime commissions throughout the region.

The College of Law Enforcement building, which was named for an outstanding member of the Board of Trustees, Henry D. Stratton, was first occupied in August 1975. This represented element seven of the program phase. The entire building is devoted to the education and training of law enforcement personnel. The building houses the College of Law Enforcement (including the Traffic Safety Institute, the Center for Criminal Justice, the Department of Law Enforcement Administration, the Department of Corrections and Criminology, and the Department of Fire Science) and the Bureau of Training for the Kentucky Law Enforcement Council. Classrooms and laboratory

facilities are provided for law enforcement courses, forensic science courses, breathalyzer and traffic safety laboratories, and various other similar programs. Facilities are also provided for the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center, which was established through this 406(e) grant, an indication of the commitment the University has to this project. However, this commitment is seen even more clearly in the facilities and equipment provided for graduate and undergraduate forensic science, since this equipment and the faculty offices and research facilities represent a very large expenditure of funds on the part of the University. Here again the chain of events set in motion by the 406(e) grant affected curriculum, which affected facilities and equipment, which affected the availability of quality forensic science education, which in turn will finally affect the quality of investigations in the criminal justice system throughout our state and our region. The breadth and length of "chain of events" is yet to be determined, but its essence is of great importance to our University and to the criminal justice system.

The joint doctoral programs, element eight of the "Program for Change," have been in effect since September 1974. There are presently eight students involved in these programs, and their areas of concentration range from criminal justice education through descriptive analysis of the criminal justice system as a social system (research), theories of criminology, and criminal justice planning, to the administration of a law

enforcement program. These students are exposed to faculty of two important criminal justice educational programs and benefit from the consistency as well as the inconsistency of perspectives within and between these programs. The anticipated difficulties of distance have not proved to be as great as had been expected. As a result of the cooperative attitudes of the faculty and administrative personnel of the participating institutions, administrative difficulties were minimal. However, there is concern that these students who have been assisted by fellowships and assistantships over the grant period will experience a loss of funds when the grant period runs out. This has been, and remains, one of the major concerns of the students and of the faculty who have been working so closely with these students. Failure to continue support of these students through the completion of their doctoral programs would be a serious loss of the time, money, and effort thus far expended.

A summary of the manpower research project for Region IV is included in Volume III. In this project the University was aided by an excellent 80 percent return rate, demonstrating the support from the institutions and agencies within our region for the efforts of our program. Also demonstrated was the very clear need for graduates of advanced criminal justice education programs. The analyses of careers of our graduates indicated that 98 percent of our graduates are presently employed; 65 percent are employed within our region and approximately 53 percent are employed within our state.

The faculty-student exchange program, beyond that aspect of the program which is embodied in the joint doctoral programs, did not materialize during the grant period. However, these programs were set in motion for later completion in succeeding years.

F. EVALUATION PHASE

Evaluation of the project by those involved in the project took place on a quarterly basis with the preparation of quarterly reports submitted to the LEAA Program Manager as the project proceeded. These "monitoring" type reports intentionally were evaluative in nature and hopefully were indicative of the evolving qualities of the program. In addition, LEAA contracted for a separate evaluation at the half-way point in the grant period. This evaluation was conducted in April 1975 by Dr. John Kelly of the University of Delaware.

Since the primary focus of the 406(e) National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium grant to Eastern Kentucky University was an enrichment of the graduate criminal justice education program, it was felt that a separate evaluation of this particular phase should be conducted. Therefore, outstanding criminal justice educational leaders were invited to the Eastern Kentucky University campus for the purpose of reviewing our curriculum and our overall program--including faculty, students, facilities, and all related aspects. The visitation team was provided with the results of a survey of

all graduate students and a survey of all faculty in the College of Law Enforcement. Both surveys dealt with all aspects of the graduate program. The results of these visitations were then organized into separate areas for discussion and analysis by the graduate faculty and graduate students of the College of Law Enforcement. The intention of this aspect of our program was two-fold: 1) to evaluate the curriculum and 2) to develop the recommendations for further curriculum change. The recommendations from the faculty-student committee established to review the report of the visitation team, and the results of the surveys, were submitted to the Dean's Curriculum Committee and approved to take effect September 1977. These included a raising of the admission requirements (GRE of 800 and a GPA of 2.75), the establishment of a faculty admissions committee for the graduate program, the requirement of a written comprehensive exam, and the provision of a thesis option of an additional six hours of graduate course work.

II. MAJOR FORCES

The intention of this subsection is to identify those forces which were of major significance in the direction of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium grant at Eastern Kentucky University. It is recognized at the outset that there were many forces which influenced both the direction and the strength of this program; however, recognizing the risk of excluding important forces, we feel that an attempt should be made to identify those which provided major influence. Among these are the support provided by the administration of the University, the support provided by the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the support and direction provided by the history of law enforcement education at Eastern Kentucky University prior to the grant period, the influence of the regional LEAA office, and, finally, the influence of the national LEAA office, including the LEAA Program Manager.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

In the discussion of significant periods in the foregoing subsection, frequent references were made to the continuing and invaluable support provided by the administration of the University. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that this support was the crucial factor in the realization of the objectives of this grant. Never, at any time, was there the least reluctance on the part of the administration of this University to support the activities of the

grant project. In fact, the University went beyond its commitment by providing additional support through the assignment of personnel, reallocation of money for resources, and provision of facilities conducive to the project objectives. This support came from the President himself and his personal commitment to criminal justice education at the University. In addition, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who has long had a personal commitment to this academic area, consistently supported the project and provided excellent advice in its administration. The final demonstration of this support, of course, is the continuation of the support of the Center by the University, through the provision of "hard-line" positions for three of the Center staff.

B. COMMONWEALTH SUPPORT

The support from the Commonwealth of Kentucky is dramatically demonstrated in the building in which we are now located. However, this facility is but a symbol (a six-million-dollar-symbol) of the support which the Governor, the Secretary of the State Department of Justice, and other personnel of the Department of Justice have provided. These agencies have made internship opportunities available to our students and, in fact, to students from other schools within the Consortium. The Department of Justice has nominated Eastern Kentucky University for additional grant support from our regional office. The Governor has given his personal support to

other proposals submitted by Eastern Kentucky University in the area of criminal justice. These agencies have also provided timely advice and consultations in many areas of program development. The most important of these was the support and advice provided to assist the efforts of Eastern Kentucky University to establish a tripartite joint doctoral program. The failure of this project was a major disappointment for the Kentucky Crime Commission and the personnel of the State Department of Justice.

C. HISTORY OF THE PROGRAM

Any social program, whether it is an educational program or a criminal justice program or whatever, necessarily feels the impact of its own history. Thus, the history of law enforcement education at Eastern Kentucky University was one of the major forces influencing the degree to which the grant project objectives were realized. We were fortunate, indeed, to have a program at Eastern Kentucky University which was well established at the University and throughout our Commonwealth and our region. This program was one of the largest law enforcement education programs in the country.

From 1966 to the date of the grant, July 1, 1973, the School of Law Enforcement at Eastern Kentucky University had established itself as a pragmatic academic program for law enforcement administrators and related personnel. The School of Law Enforcement at Eastern Kentucky University was not viewed

as a fountain of theoretical innovation. Rather, the program was clearly founded upon the necessity for a pragmatic educational program for law enforcement personnel. The emphasis of the faculty historically was upon teaching, rather than research, and practical issues of law enforcement, rather than the development of theoretical conceptual models.

The result of this history was that the Eastern Kentucky University Law Enforcement program was well accepted within the law enforcement community. Our graduates and faculty were viewed not as intellectual "eggheads" but as pragmatic academicians who knew the needs of law enforcement and provided resources for practical solutions to meet those needs. As we moved into an advanced level of graduate education, which required the development of conceptual models and expanded research activities, these foundations were of great importance. The acceptance of the law enforcement program at Eastern Kentucky University among law enforcement personnel in agencies throughout the Commonwealth and throughout the region enabled researchers and other members of the faculty and student body of the College of Law Enforcement to perform their tasks with minimal threat to practitioners.

This is not to say that the reputation of the law enforcement program at Eastern Kentucky University, with its emphasis upon practical applications, is generally admired. There are institutions, agencies, and individuals who consider the proper role of higher education to be less pragmatic and more

conceptual. These groups give higher priority to "pure research" than to applied research, higher priority to theory construction than to theory application, and higher priority to a liberal arts background than to professional education. In fact, this view of higher education has a rich history in itself, going back to the idea of the separation between body and soul as early as the thirteenth century in which the liberal arts were considered analogous to the soul of man. The criminal justice program at the graduate level at Eastern Kentucky University has built upon its pragmatic history to develop a program that may be seen as "keeping body and soul together."

D. REGIONAL OFFICE

The Regional Office of Region IV of LEAA could well be a valuable partner in the development and advancement of graduate higher education in this region. The personnel in the staff of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center at Eastern Kentucky University looked forward to the possibility of working with the personnel of our regional office in the development of a responsive academic and research program. Unfortunately, not all of the promises have been realized. The history of the creation of the Consortium and the history of the organization of LEAA on a national and regional basis have been such that the administrative relationship between the Consortium school and the region has been confused. It is not

our feeling that this is the fault of any individual either at Eastern Kentucky University or in the regional office; rather, it appears to be an outgrowth of an unclear administrative system that may have been aggravated by the process of selection of Consortium schools. Nevertheless, the regional office has had a major impact upon the graduate criminal justice education program at Eastern through the LEEP support program.

E. NATIONAL LEAA OFFICE

In the history of criminal justice in the United States, no agency has had as great an impact upon the system as the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. At Eastern Kentucky University, the award of the 406(e) grant has had a major impact upon graduate education in the College of Law Enforcement. Beyond this, during the grant this agency has served as a major force in the evolution of our graduate program. In their comments regarding curriculum and their emphasis on research, representatives of LEAA have had a great influence upon the direction of our educational program. This can be seen most particularly in the emphasis in our program upon comparative international criminal justice systems. It was the initial encouragement from Mr. Velde, then the Assistant Administrator of LEAA, that first stimulated this focus and, though the international program which had been originally planned did not materialize, the curriculum component which

focuses upon international criminal justice in developing countries can be directly attributed to this influence.

In addition, the assistance and guidance provided by Mr. Norval Jespersen and his successor, Mr. Carl Hamm, have been supportive of the continued development of our graduate program. Their assistance and guidance have enabled the project to move through the various stages of development toward the accomplishment of the project objectives with minimal difficulty. However, during these developmental stages, it became evident that LEAA personnel working with a project such as this, which involves a sophisticated educational program, should have a wider background in the administration of higher education. The difficulties which arose, though few, inevitably hinged upon problems of academic processes not easily understood by those who are unfamiliar with the administration of higher education. It was not until Dr. Price Foster was appointed to direct the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training that the LEAA personnel working in this area possessed the necessary academic experience. This appointment has had a major positive impact upon the Consortium effort.

III. IMPACT OF PERSONNEL

In the previous discussions we have reviewed the impact upon the project of forces which have in one way or another influenced the direction or impetus of the program. In this subsection, we want to illustrate how individuals in a program can by their efforts, or lack of efforts, influence the direction of a major project. Often, the question of the success or failure of a project is oversimplified; it is thought that success or failure can be attributed to inadequate funds, facilities, or inadequate administrative support. In fact, success or failure more often may be attributed to the activities of specific individuals, activities which, when integrated into an interpersonal set of interactions, either fail or succeed to generate direction and force. Such was the case of the group of individuals who interacted in the 406(e) National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium project at Eastern Kentucky University. Actually, many individuals were involved in this interaction "set," only a few of whom can be pointed out at this time. The purpose of such an identification is not to bestow compliments upon any individual, but rather to demonstrate the functional relationships which were important in this enterprise. Therefore, individuals will be identified by position rather than by name, although those familiar with the project will be able to identify the individuals holding those positions without much difficulty.

It has been demonstrated that the support from the administration of the University was a vital element in the level of success attained by the 406(e) project. Without the personal support of the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, we would never have had the project at Eastern Kentucky University in the first place. Moreover, at crucial periods throughout the program, support from these gentlemen proved to be the essential factor in attaining the immediate objective. An example of this is the support from these gentlemen when opposition developed on our campus about the addition of sixteen new courses to our graduate curriculum. Skillful administration enabled us to gather the support necessary to implement these curricular changes. However, this type of administrative support was not limited to curriculum; it touched upon every aspect of the program whenever needed.

The former Director was able to provide an integration of the Center into the College of Law Enforcement which was essential in the realization of its proper objectives. This was partially due to his dual role as Associate Dean and Director of the Center; however, it is strongly felt that his vision and the strength of his will were much more important. His departure at a point halfway through the project was a serious loss both to the project and to the College of Law Enforcement.

The project was also aided by the activities of various faculty members who assumed supportive roles for the Center.

It should be noted that there was no lack of volunteers to take trips, to receive support for their professional conference attendance, or even to receive support for summer teaching. In fact, it was frequently difficult to separate those honestly committed to a specific project from those who intended to use a project to their own ends.

One of the unfortunate experiences of the Center resulted from just such a mistake. A faculty member proposed a project and, after a review of the proposal, the Center supported his project. The first half of the project required that he prepare himself personally and that he set up a cadre of graduate students for the second stage of the project. However, the second stage never materialized since this particular faculty member resigned and took another position, negotiations for which had been proceeding for some time.

With the exception of this rather significant disappointment, the project was blessed with the support of committed faculty members who assumed various responsibilities for research. Beyond this, one faculty member devoted a great deal of personal time and effort to the development of the joint doctoral programs. Without this support and his support on the master's level curriculum, it would have been very difficult to achieve these milestones in the project.

Other faculty members, in addition to their normal responsibilities, developed library holdings and assisted in the development of expanded library holdings, coordinated with the agencies in the state for internship programs, and assisted in the development of new courses and curricular offerings.

Since the Center was fortunate to have a cadre of competent professionals who were dedicated to their tasks, it hardly seems appropriate to identify specific individuals. However, it is appropriate to comment upon some personnel administrative difficulties experienced in the project. A project such as this, which has a life span of thirty-six months, is indeed fortunate to attract the quality of personnel that this project at Eastern Kentucky University attracted. Positions with the project offered the excitement of challenge, but such challenges are frequently accompanied by a high potential for failure. A high degree of academic competence was demanded, but no tenure was offered. Extensive academic experience was required, but initially no academic rank was offered. As a result, the positions were difficult to fill, and finding appropriate personnel required a great deal of time and effort from the Dean and the Associate Dean of the College. This project was indeed fortunate to have the services of committed professional personnel represented by the Research Director, the Research Associate, and the Curriculum Coordinator. Unfortunately, projects of relatively short duration require the

highest level of professional competence while offering less professional security. Personnel of this quality usually hold responsible positions, with tenure and high salaries. Only through the intensive efforts of the former Director were these individuals persuaded to come to the Eastern Kentucky University campus.

Moreover, there were corresponding difficulties in filling clerical positions, since the demands upon secretarial staff were frequently greater than those in other offices at the University and the salaries were not commensurate with the level of responsibilities the secretaries were expected to assume. The quality of performance by secretarial staff in a project such as this should be viewed as one of the essential elements, not a tangential afterthought.

IV. STUDENTS

While the faculty of any college may be viewed as the heart of the educational process, the student body provides the flesh and substance of the entire program. Prior to the awarding of the 406(e) National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium grant for Eastern Kentucky University, our student body was an exceedingly diverse group of young men and women. The average level of academic potential, measured in terms of GRE and undergraduate GPA, was not impressive. The average GRE was 836 with a range of 530 to 1190 and the average undergraduate GPA was 2.93 with a range of 2.1 to 3.8. Only 10 of 73 previous students (13.7 percent) had had a GRE of 1000 or better.

A review of our student body over the years prior to July 1973 indicated that students who performed well in their graduate program at Eastern Kentucky University were, for the most part, the more mature students who had a high degree of motivation. Frequently, these students performed at a higher level than one would anticipate based on potential measured by GRE and undergraduate GPA. Many of these students were in-service students, working in the law enforcement system.

In the assessment conducted during the first phase of the 406(e) project, students were interviewed and students' records were analyzed. Many students expressed apprehension with regard to the development of an "enriched academic program." It was not uncommon for students to question the value of a

more rigorous curriculum for law enforcement majors, and the thesis requirement was the subject of much criticism. The existing academic program was considered by these students to be as intense as was necessary, and many faculty supported this point of view. It was concluded that, although LEAA and the administration of the University may have been committed to an upgrading and enrichment of the academic program, this commitment was not shared by the student body. It should be pointed out that this was not a universal reaction within the student body; however, it was the general attitude expressed in interviews at this preliminary stage of curriculum change. (It was interesting to observe that student attitudes expressed in the evaluation survey near the end of the grant period reflected a change--the newer courses were clearly the most popular. The visitation team verified this in their interviews with students.)

It was determined by the Director of the Center, who was also Acting Dean of the College of Law Enforcement, and the Coordinator of the Center that the early attitude very likely reflected the students' previous academic backgrounds and an academic program which had not prepared them for thesis production. It was felt that, although there might very well be a significant place in the criminal justice system for graduates with a master's degree whose academic potential did not appear to be strong, there was also an important role to be played in the system by highly qualified graduates of a

doctoral program and that the focus of our efforts in the 406(e) project should be upon the most qualified graduate students. To this end, those students who indicated the highest level of potential (1000 GRE and 3.0 UGPA or better) were identified and given particular attention and encouragement in further academic pursuits. As the new courses in the curriculum were offered, faculty were asked informally to identify and encourage the most promising students. These students were offered assistantships and/or fellowships and assigned various research projects to stimulate their interest and further the research objectives of the Center.

The present student body reflects these experiences. The opposition to the thesis as an element in the graduate program has not dissolved, but the quality of this experience is attested to by a large majority of the graduates. The most challenging courses are frequently the most popular. The courses added to the curriculum have gained wide acceptance among our graduate students, as reflected by a survey of the students conducted as part of the evaluation effort. Moreover, the interaction among students has focused increasingly upon academic issues and research questions. As this intensification of academic pursuits among the students increases, the classroom instructor finds a fertile ground for a higher level of conceptualization. It is our feeling that even the students with less academic potential benefit from these academic experiences and that the master's program, as well as the doctoral program, has been improved.

It would be false to claim that an educational metamorphosis has taken place, or that individuals have changed their character or outgrown their limitations. Indeed, such changes are beyond reason. Neither the majority of the faculty nor the majority of students seek to encumber their personal lives with intense academic challenges. It is not unusual in the academic world that the effort to enrich programs represents a threat to a significant number of faculty and students. Eastern Kentucky University is no different in this respect.

The applications for the graduate program for 1975-76 revealed that the qualifications of the applicants were much higher and that the applicants frequently indicated an interest in pursuing the Ph.D., as well as the master's degree. Overall, the "tone" of the student body during this final year of the grant has been one of pride in the program, a sense of accomplishment academically, and a confidence that they (the students) can, if they wish, accomplish the highest level of academic success. This sense of confidence in their own academic abilities is felt to be one of the major accomplishments of the 406(e) project; it is a confidence that comes as a result of performance of high quality academic work. Whether or not the individual student eventually goes on to complete a doctorate, it is our belief that this experience has been an important step forward for personnel going into the criminal justice system.

V. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the 406(e) National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium grant for Eastern Kentucky University were as follows: A) Graduate Program Development, B) Faculty and Student Exchange, C) Manpower and Related Research Projects, and D) Research Related to Curriculum and Instructional Improvement.

Under the heading Graduate Program Development, the program narrative stated:

"Expansion and refinement of existing master's degree programs in criminal justice and the development of a cooperative doctorate program with one or more universities. The latter will likely mean that a student will complete two years of graduate study at Eastern and the third year of the program at a cooperating institution."

Under the statement Faculty and Student Exchange, the program narrative stated:

"It is important in both student and faculty development that broad exposure in diverse institutional settings be provided. Relationships will be established with several institutions to provide for such exchanges."

Under Manpower and Related Research Projects, the program narrative stated:

"There is a critical need for first rate research, including projections, related to manpower needs in the criminal justice systems. Manpower research projects will be identified, in concert with LEAA staff, and will be conducted by graduate students supervised by research staff who will also be heavily involved in the research design and execution."

Under the heading Research Related to Curriculum and Instructional Improvement, the program narrative stated:

"The intent of this project is to design and mount a number of subprojects that will focus on curriculum development and evaluation, and instructional improvement. The overriding emphasis is to relate this research to more effective curricula and instruction in keeping with the diversity to existing and emerging manpower needs in the criminal justice system."

As the project developed, certain changes took place in the interpretation and content of the objectives. In the November meeting of the Board of Directors, the Assistant Administrator of LEAA conducted an extensive discussion of an "international component" for the project, to provide research in international criminal justice and curricular capabilities at the graduate level in this area. As it happens, this component did not materialize as a Consortium project. However, it was continued at Eastern Kentucky University as a component, the purposes of which were to expand research into this area of study and to enable a criminal justice graduate program at Eastern Kentucky University to develop a specialization in criminal justice systems in developing countries.

In the December meeting of the Board of Directors of the Consortium, the Program Manager, Mr. Norval Jespersen, indicated that LEAA viewed technology transfer as a major component of the objectives of the Consortium. At Eastern Kentucky University it was felt that technology transfer should naturally follow expansion of the research element of the program, since the technology to be transferred should be related to contemporary problems in the criminal

justice system and their resolution. Therefore, the expansion of the research activities at the graduate level was given even greater emphasis at this point in our development.

Turning now to the stated objectives of the project, we intend in this subsection to view the history of the project in terms of these objectives. The first objective and the objective given first priority at Eastern Kentucky University was to enhance and expand the master's degree program and to develop a cooperative doctoral program. This required extensive analysis of the present status of the program and a determination of new directions. The process by which these were accomplished has been discussed above. At this point, at the completion of the grant project, we can say the master's program has been enriched and that students and faculty have responded with a refreshing stimulation to the interaction of concepts and their applications. There exist two cooperative criminal justice doctorates, one with the University of Maryland and one with Michigan State University. In addition, a third cooperative doctorate exists in criminal justice education with the College of Education at the University of Kentucky. The viability of these programs is demonstrated by their increasing number of applicants and the success of the doctoral candidates. There are presently no graduates of these programs, since a doctoral program is at least three years in duration and the grant period was not long enough to enable any one doctoral candidate to complete his degree.

The second objective of the project, the faculty-student exchange program, was a most difficult objective to accomplish. Students are being transferred through the joint doctoral program to other institutions, and faculty do participate in joint committees with faculty from other institutions. However, the actual exchange of faculty and students has been a complex logistical problem, necessitating coordination from the Consortium Coordinator's Office. Since Dr. Gilbert Bruns has been Coordinator of the Consortium, efforts have been made to implement this component of the Consortium objectives. Surveys of faculty have been conducted, and information has been distributed relative to the possibility of exchange for students. There is now, as the project nears termination, considerable interest on the part of our faculty and our student body in the possibility of participating in this exchange program. In the opinion of the Center staff, this interest could not have existed among the students and faculty during the first year of the grant period, in view of their apprehension about their own academic competencies. We anticipate that, if logistical problems can be resolved, the faculty-student exchange program can be implemented during the near future. However, it should be noted that faculty assignments to courses are made one year in advance. Moreover, most faculty have additional committee and other administrative assignments as well as commitments to provide various services within the state, all of which necessitate advanced planning of over one year.

Manpower research, a third objective of the project, was the specific responsibility of the Research Director of the Center. The research activities under this rubric are described in the report on the manpower research. The input from this research project has provided valuable information for program development and career counseling of graduate students. Hopefully, it will add to the overall knowledge of manpower needs and resources for the United States.

Research related to curriculum and instructional improvement, the fourth objective, was reinterpreted from the implications contained in the initial description of the objectives. Research which was conducted was directed toward expanding knowledge and developing academic capabilities in specific areas. In this way, it was felt that the curriculum and instruction provided in the graduate program would be improved. The implications of the descriptive statement following the objective in the program narrative seem to carry an emphasis upon teaching methodology. It was the considered opinion of the Director and the Coordinator that research and development of faculty expertise in the subject area should be given higher priority in the improvement of curriculum and instruction than pure methodology. Moreover, methodological research, and particularly the development of a behavioral objectives research project devoid of strong content, would prove to be less than adequate. However, a behavioral objectives project was developed and additional funding sought to no avail. Dr.

Skinner, the Curriculum Coordinator, developed an excellent behavioral objectives delivery package. With the culmination of content-oriented research projects, it is anticipated that the University will explore alternative methodologies and attempt to implement the behavioral objectives approach to teaching.

.VI. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The 406(e) National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium project at Eastern Kentucky University was monitored by a Program Manager appointed by LEAA. Mr. Norval Jespersen was assigned this responsibility through May 1974 and was replaced in this capacity by Mr. Carl Hamm. Each of the gentlemen received quarterly reports throughout the project from the Coordinating Center for Criminal Justice at Eastern Kentucky University. In addition, Mr. Jespersen reviewed current developments of the University with the Director at each Consortium Board of Directors meeting (at that time, the meetings were monthly). Mr. Hamm used the telephone to discuss problems as they occurred and occasionally discussed various problems at Consortium Board of Directors meetings. This composed the LEAA monitoring of the project.

Beyond this, the administration at Eastern Kentucky University monitored budgetary expenditures and programming. Authorizations for major expenditures or major alterations of job assignments were required to be cleared through the Dean of the College, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and/or the Controller's Office. This was very helpful for the administration of the project, since it avoided inadvertent errors and assured that all had a complete understanding of the project as it evolved. On occasion, the Vice President for Academic Affairs would check with the Program Manager to assure himself that a specific procedure or action being proposed was in accordance with the regulations of LEAA.

Within the project, all proposals regarding procedures, actions, or assignments were required to be cleared through the Director. In addition, the Director reviewed the activities of each staff member periodically. Effective January 1975, every mini-grant project proposal was required to be submitted as a formal proposal outlining objectives, methodology, personnel, time frames, and budget. Each project was reviewed periodically with the project supervisor, and complete reports were required.

The purpose of the monitoring was to insure that the direction of the project was consistent with its objectives, that procedures and expenditures were consistent with LEAA and University regulations and with project administrative procedures, and, finally, that appropriate records were maintained for later reference. The three-level monitoring system provided for articulation and comprehensive coverage and is strongly recommended for future projects of this type.

Evaluation of the project was conducted on two levels. The LEAA midpoint evaluation was conducted in April 1975 under a separate contract. The evaluator, Dr. John Kelly, visited the Eastern Kentucky University campus and met with students and faculty in individual and group sessions. He also met with staff of the Center in individual and group sessions and with other personnel of the University administration. In addition, he reviewed all pertinent documents relative to students, curriculum, faculty, research programs,

search programs, and overall project activities. It is understood that a follow-up evaluation will be conducted by LEAA upon completion of the project.

Internal evaluation of the project was conducted in two ways: 1) An evaluation of the curriculum was conducted during the final year of the Consortium under the direction of the Graduate Curriculum Coordinator; and 2) Each mini-grant project was evaluated. These evaluations focused upon the goals of the project, the objectives, the tasks or activities, and the consistency between these elements. The evaluations were intended to provide both qualitative and quantitative data.

VII. SUMMARY

The 406(e) National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium grant to Eastern Kentucky University authorized and funded a project, the goal of which was to enhance and expand criminal justice education at the graduate level. The original grant was for a period of three years, commencing July 1, 1973. An extension was authorized which brought the total time span of the project to thirty-nine months, July 1, 1973, to September 30, 1976. In the case of Eastern Kentucky University, this goal was translated in terms of enhancing and expanding the master's level program and developing a cooperative doctoral program. This goal led to four primary objectives: A) Graduate Program Development, B) Faculty and Student Exchange, C) Manpower and Related Research Projects, and D) Research Related to Curriculum and Instructional Improvement. An additional objective, technology transfer, was urged upon the project by the Program Manager. A sixth objective, the development of an international criminal justice research component, was first encouraged, and then not funded, by LEAA.

Each of these objectives had its own impact upon the criminal justice education program at Eastern Kentucky University and, through this program, on other elements in the University, as well as upon individuals and agencies in our state and in our region. All objectives were set in motion, and progress was made in the accomplishment of each. However,

these objectives were not terminal in nature. That is, in each case the objective was to set in motion a process, whether that process was to conduct research, to enhance and expand an educational program, or to establish a faculty-student exchange program. The first objective, development of the graduate program, clearly represents the greatest progress made through the 406(e) grant project; the manpower research objective comes a close second. One may say that these two objectives clearly were accomplished although, from the perspective of those involved in the project, these efforts will need continuous support and activity. Other research projects directed toward curriculum and instruction improvement may also be said to have been accomplished, but the stages of development of this objective are also continuous and will need increased efforts on the part of our personnel at the College of Law Enforcement at Eastern Kentucky University, as well as additional funding. The faculty-student exchange programs may also be said to have been accomplished. However, the stages of development of this very promising aspect of the project have not all been realized and will need continued coordination and support.

The above comments provide an indication of new directions for activities set in motion by the 406(e) grant project. These follow the paths provided by the objectives of the grant project, both those officially agreed to by the University and those encouraged by LEAA during the project period.

The activities related to the development of the joint doctoral programs have stimulated increasing pressures from students and faculty alike for the University to develop its own doctoral program in criminal justice. This would require legislative authorization and would signify a new direction in higher education in Kentucky. At the present time, this possibility is remote; however, every element implicit in a doctoral program will be present on our campus at the completion of the 406(e) grant project, and those who have worked to develop the joint doctoral program eagerly look forward to the possibility of an Eastern Kentucky University doctorate in criminal justice.

The activities in the area of manpower research and career development for criminal justice master's and doctoral graduates have increased the interest and activity of the University in the area of manpower research and job placement. Efforts are presently being directed toward the establishment of a job information center for the eight-state Region IV in which we are located. Dr. Donald Skinner is directing this effort and is working with the appropriate state and regional offices to establish the criminal justice career information center at Eastern Kentucky University. The importance of this new direction for criminal justice in our region cannot be overestimated. At the present time, without a systematic process, positions are necessarily filled on the basis of personal contact which, it is felt, provides great leeway for

political influence in the criminal justice system. Thus, this new direction could place an emphasis upon professionalism and deemphasize the influence of patronage in the criminal justice system, an objective implicit in the development of graduate higher education for criminal justice personnel.

The new directions provided by research may also have considerable significance for criminal justice higher education. The Conference on Court Administration, which was conducted on this campus, is an example of a new direction. In this case the conference, organized by Dr. Skinner, focused upon the evaluation of alternative educational programs for court administrators and provided the substance for the systematic design of a graduate court administration educational program. Other research--including comparative criminal justice systems, value consistency in the criminal justice system, and victimization--provides the substance for new directions in curriculum, in research, and in service to our constituents.

The student-faculty exchange program in itself is a new direction in higher education. Although this program was not as fully implemented as other phases of the project, the partial implementation through the joint doctoral programs provides a sound basis to build upon in the future.

The international comparative criminal justice system component provides a new direction for criminal justice education at Eastern Kentucky University, and the specialization

within this area on comparative criminal justice in developing countries is a new direction for criminal justice higher education generally. It is our hope that we will be able to continue this new direction in the future.

Thus, criminal justice higher education at Eastern Kentucky University has witnessed significant changes in content and scope generated by the 406(e) grant. In addition, the project has enabled the University to identify new directions for academic development and for service to the criminal justice system.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
PROGRAM HISTORY

By
John H. McNamara
Victor G. Strecher

INTRODUCTION

The following is a history not only of the activities of the MSU School of Criminal Justice during the period of the 406(e) grant-related activities but also of the School from its inception in 1935 as one of the first university programs in the area of criminal justice. A greater emphasis is being placed on early years of the School in an attempt to capture the development of a program in a time when there existed few models upon which to draw. It is also a history of people who must be considered pioneers in the field of criminal justice education. It is our hope that the dynamic nature of this development is communicated in what was originally a much larger report than could be reproduced here.

This is also, of course, a report of the uses to which the LEAA funds were put. Problems experienced in the development of the Criminal Justice Systems Center are discussed, and

some solutions to these problems are presented. The growing pains of the Center are described, and its development as an adjunct to the traditional classroom learning of research is highlighted. It is our hope that others can profit from both the correct decisions and the mistakes identified in this report.

I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM

ORIGINS IN IMPETUS

For some time prior to the spring of 1935, Colonel Oscar Olander, Commissioner of the Michigan State Police (MSP), had been prevailing upon the President of Michigan State College, Dr. Robert S. Shaw, to establish a program in police administration for pre-service students and working police officers. De. Le'oyne Snyder, a member of the Michigan State Crime Commission at that time and a consulting forensic scientist, had also been active in urging the College to adopt such a program. As a result of these influences, a committee convened in June of 1935 to consider the feasibility of the program. The committee consisted of Deans R. C. Houston, H. B. Dirks, and L. C. Emmons, representing Michigan State College, Herbert P. Orr, Harry G. Gault, and Jay W. Linsey of the Michigan State Crime Commission, and MSP Commissioner Olander as chairman.

This committee not only studied the feasibility of a police administration program but also developed the contents of the new program. During July of 1935, what was known as a "Police Administration Course" was officially approved by Michigan State College and added to the Division of Applied Science under Dean Ralph C. Houston. The delightful simplicity and speed of this development and approval are striking in this day of trilevel committees, each with subcommittees, and final approvals by a large academic governance council representative of the faculty. In this connection it is significant to note

that the original approaches that were made to the President of the College involved John A. Hannah, then secretary to the State Board of Agriculture (the governing body of Michigan State College), who had an important role in enabling the committee to complete its task and receive College approval.

Captain Caesar Scavarda, Director of Training for the Michigan State Police, was the delegated representative of Commissioner Olander in the continuing development of the program and its administration. Instructor Donald Bremer was appointed by the College as the first chairman of the program; he also taught courses in law.

Considering the timing of other programming, particularly the work of Vollmer in California and Chicago and his extensive writing on the subject of improved police education in the Wickersham Commission Report of 1928-29, there is a strong temptation to attribute Michigan State's new program to Vollmer's influence or the existence of previous programs in Chicago, Wisconsin, Berkeley, and San Jose. There is, however, no trace of these influences in the beginnings of the Michigan State program. Early graduates of the program, including a graduate of the first class of 1938, have no memory of Vollmer's or other programs in other parts of the country at that time.

SIGNIFICANT PERIODS IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

The history of criminal justice at Michigan State can be divided as follows:

- 1935-1941 Beginnings
- 1942-1945 Scaling Down and Dormancy
- 1946-1957 Resurgence, Diversification, and Growth
- 1958-1965 Program Stability
- 1966 Second Major Curriculum Revision
- 1967-1971 Emergence of Criminal Justice Concept
- 1972-1975 Third Major Curriculum Revision

These are, of course, arbitrarily defined periods in the development of the School. They relate to the program rather than to the nature and size of the faculty, student body, or organizational locale of the School.

1935-1941 BEGINNINGS

That first program in Police Administration, devised and approved too late to be included in the 1935 catalog of MSC, appears as follows in the 1936 edition of the catalog:

POLICE ADMINISTRATION COURSE

The course in police administration is offered in cooperation with the Michigan Crime Commission and Michigan State Police to meet a growing demand for trained police executives and specialists. The curriculum combines a study of the basic sciences with that of modern methods of crime prevention and detection.

The student will complete in residence at the College the equivalent of three years and one term (at least 164 credits and points equal to number of credits earned). This will be followed by an eighteen months' period of training under the immediate direction of the MSP. At least six months will be in residence at the barracks. (30 credits will be allowed for this training.)

During his residence at the barracks, the student will complete military science 411 and 412 in which he will be permitted to register without charge. Because of the four year military requirement, it is necessary that the applicant upon entering be qualified to pass the physical examination required of advanced military students.

The new program found a ready clientele. A 1949 publication states that "the fall of 1935 saw an enrollment of 45 men in police administration."¹ It is known that this initial enrollment consisted of freshmen, sophomores, and juniors who constituted the graduating classes of 1938 (3 graduates), 1939 (19), and 1940 (17). The graduates in the class of 1938 had transferred into the new program from the College of Education in 1935. The catalog description of the program understated the focus upon the natural sciences of that original Police Administration curriculum. More will be said about this very heavy concentration on the natural sciences, which was thought to be appropriate to a professional program at that time.

Another aspect of the initial program was its very close relationship to the MSP. The 18 months of field training consisted of 6 months in residence at the State Police barracks in East Lansing, with the remaining 12 months divided among the Detroit Police Department, the U. S. Secret Service, the Federal Narcotics Bureau, and the Plant Protection Unit of the Oldsmobile Motor Division, General Motors Corporation. Additionally, the first graduating class, while in the field training program, received maintenance of \$1 per day plus room and board, funded by the MSP.² An austerity budget for the State Police in 1938 required that this daily maintenance cost could

no longer be covered by them; however, students in field training continued to receive room and board while receiving training at State Police installations.

The program grew continuously to a peak enrollment of 194 students in 1938. Thereafter, more stringent physical requirements resulted in a reduction in enrollment to 115 in 1940 (Fagan, 1949). An average of 20 students graduated each year between 1939 and 1943 when the war reduced the program's output to a trickle of 3 in 1944, none in 1945, and 2 in 1946. More will be said about the number and the kinds of students in the program, the goals and dimensions of the curriculum, and the faculty in later sections of this report. Briefly it can be stated that this initial program was instituted with the cosponsorship of a state police organization, that it received very much of its support in instructional systems from that organization, and that it reflected the values and interests of law enforcement in that period.

1942-1945 SCALING DOWN AND DORMANCY

Although the graduating classes of 1942 and 1943 were of approximately the same size as the previous three years, the program was admitting fewer and fewer new students because of the demand for young men in the military services. The requirement that enrollees be physically qualified for commissions in the armed forces automatically made them subject to immediate induction into the armed forces. New courses were added to the program during the last three years of Instructor

Bremer's tenure in the program. His successor, Professor Tom H. King, maintained the program with the same curriculum and decreasing numbers of students between 1942 and 1946.

One noteworthy occurrence is that the program was shifted from the Division of Applied Science to the Division of Business and Public Service in 1945. It was at the same time that MSC added a program in public administration to its catalog.

1946-1957 RESURGENCE, DIVERSIFICATION, AND GROWTH

This period may be regarded as one of the most significant in the development of the School of Criminal Justice. It was during this time that the School established its essential thrust, broke away from previous dominance of the MSP, added faculty in numbers, diversity, and variety of perspectives, entered on a course of specialization among several criminal justice functions, began its master's program, and began to have an increasing influence upon the criminal justice working world.

It was in 1946 that Arthur F. Brandstatter, then Chief of Police of the City of East Lansing, became assistant head of the Department of Police Administration under Professor King. Brandstatter, a member of the first graduating class, initiated new courses within the program, moved several of the existing courses away from the classrooms of the Police Training Academy and onto the campus, and began a search for new faculty members. The first of these, Ralph Turner, joined the faculty in 1947 at about the same time that Brandstatter

became head of the department. Turner brought with him the first specialization--forensic science--in a sense formalizing in the academic setting the apprenticeship which he had served with Dr. J. H. Matthews at the University of Wisconsin in the middle 1930's.

A year later Robert Scott joined the faculty with responsibility for developing a program in crime prevention to which the first female students were admitted. Scott later diversified this program to juvenile delinquency control and eventually to correctional administration. The first courses in Traffic Safety Administration were offered in the fall of 1952 by Gordon Sheehe, who left the School five years later to direct the Highway Safety Center on the Michigan State campus. After Professor Scott left the School to become Deputy Commissioner of the Michigan Department of Corrections for Youth Programs, Dr. James Brennen joined the faculty in 1955 to further develop the Delinquency Control Program. That same year Dr. Albert Germann, Marshall Houts, and Sanford Schultz became members of the faculty for industrial security, criminal law, evidence, and police administration courses.

By this time the School was teaching all of its courses on campus and had transferred administration of the Field Service Training Program from the Michigan State Police Academy to the School. Professor Jack Ryan was the first coordinator of the Field Training Program, followed by Fred Jergens, and then in 1956 Victor Strecher was appointed to coordinate the

Field Service Training Program. In that same year Frank Day was appointed to teach law and police administration courses.

Fall term 1957 saw the arrival of the last new faculty appointee for new programming: Alfred Schnur assumed responsibility for an expanded correctional administration program. That same year Joseph Nichol and Robert Sheehan were appointed to teach forensic science and industrial security, respectively.

It was during this period also that the School began offering short courses for in-service police personnel, about which more will be said later in this report. Charles Rhoades was employed in 1951 to coordinate in-service short courses, succeeded by Harold Hahn two years later. At the same time, large numbers of students and observers from many nations began coming to the School of Police Administration for degree programs, short courses, visits and observation, and as guest lecturers.

The faculty established an identity and began to influence criminal justice activities far beyond the boundaries of Michigan State College during these years. Turner became a charter member and first secretary-treasurer of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences in 1950; Scott participated in a White House Conference on Youth Problems. The first female police administration graduate was Daisy Kim of Honolulu. Turner initiated a long-term alcohol testing program, widely reported in the American press, which eventually established the

accuracy and reliability standards for national policy. Brandstatter assisted Governor Williams in developing and proposing the Highway Traffic Administration Center which was created soon afterward.

In the fall of 1948, A. F. Brandstatter was contacted by the then War Department and asked to consult with Chief Public Safety Officers in the American-occupied zone of Western Germany. The purpose of this visit was to discuss the possibility of Michigan State College sponsoring a program of training and education for police officers from West Germany. It is interesting to note that this concept was originally proposed by O. W. Wilson, who was a Chief Public Safety Officer and on leave from his position as Dean of the School of Criminology, University of California at Berkeley. Wilson's plan had been submitted initially to the Board of Regents of the University of California who rejected the proposal. The Department of Police Administration was then consulted and the governing State Board of Agriculture approved the plan. Arrangements were made for carefully selected groups of German police officers to spend three months at Michigan State during which time they received classroom instruction in American policing procedures and worked in various police departments in an observer capacity. The program began in the spring of 1950 and continued until 1954. This program is regarded by some as probably the most efficient, cost-effective program the School ever engaged in. There was a simple, direct contract with the War

Department which eliminated an amazing amount of costly, unnecessary, middle management bureaucracy. The program was carefully audited and received high marks from both the participants and the War Department. This program undoubtedly marked the beginning of the School's continued involvement in the international police-criminal justice scene.

In 1954, Brandstatter was a member of a Michigan State University team sponsored by the U. S. Department of State which conducted a survey of the then emerging Republic of South Vietnam. The purpose of the survey was to explore the possibility of Michigan State University providing services in the foreign aid program then being devised for that country. This survey resulted in the establishment of the Michigan State University Groups, located in Saigon, and attached to the U. S. Overseas Mission. The University provided advisor services in the fields of public administration, budgeting, taxation, and public safety. Police advisors worked with the public safety forces of South Vietnam. Chief police advisors in the project during the period 1955-63 were Howard Hoyt, Jack Ryan, Ralph Turner, and E. H. Adkins. As a result of participation in this program, the School of Police Administration began attracting many students from the Far East and Pacific Basin nations. As with the German program, the School has continued to maintain contact and liaison with its graduates, both in Europe and Asia. The final result of these foreign experiences has been the development of a Comparative

Criminal Justice course taught both on campus and, in alternate years, in London, England. These courses were begun by Turner.

In 1955 the first National Institute on Police Community Relations was cosponsored by the School of Criminal Justice on the MSU campus. This program was to grow into an annual program of 15 years' duration and set in motion an international trend in police organizational structuring and police interaction policies. It also led to curricular changes in the School and faculty additions.

It was also in 1955 that the School began its master's program. According to the 1956 MSU catalog, the program was envisioned as one "designed to further the capacities of career people in law enforcement administration, correctional administration, and security administration. Areas of study such as criminalistics, delinquency prevention and control, and highway traffic administration are also available." (Emphasis supplied.) Three core courses in administration, law, and deviant behavior were required, and students selected other electives from within the School and other units of the University.

In the context of curriculum development, this period may be regarded as that of the first large-scale curriculum revision. It was a revision accomplished by accretion rather than short-term, deliberate design and implementation. But it was a genuine curriculum revision in the sense of its departure from the previous program as offered in cooperation with the MSP.

1958-1965 PROGRAM STABILITY

Having developed a highly diversified and specialized program and having added the kinds of faculty members required to teach and administer such a program, the School settled down to a period of relative stability. There was growth in the student body, and there were, of course, the routine replacements of a highly mobile faculty and occasional adjustments of course offerings. However, the essential thrust of the program developed during the previous period was sustained with remarkably little alteration. The most noticeable change in the program was the output of graduates--nearly doubled to 88 graduates per year over the preceding developmental period. Of course, considering the four-year lag between time of entry and graduation, this large increase in the number of degrees awarded may be regarded as an expression of increased interest in the new specializations being implemented by the School during the previous period.

1966 SECOND MAJOR CURRICULUM REVISION

In contrast to the developmental period of 1946-1957, the second curriculum revision was undertaken with a deliberate sense of design and with clear goals in mind. The most striking feature of the undergraduate program was the establishment of a core curriculum with optional electives in the special fields. It was a natural consequence of experience with the previous program, particularly an increasing awareness that there was a central minimum of knowledge that all students--

regardless of their major field--should master before proceeding into specializations. This minimum central core was established for all students. There was also substantial weeding out, subdividing, and recombination of course materials from the previous curriculum. Several courses were added to the master's program. This new curriculum, which appeared for the first time in the catalog of 1966, was developed during the previous two years.

1967-1971 EMERGENCE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE CONCEPT

By this time the School was no longer offering a program in police administration, or even police administration and public safety. With the exception of law school training and judicial administration, the School had clearly evolved into a full-scale criminal justice program dealing with all segments of the processing of criminal cases. Events beginning with the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, moving on to the Safe Streets Act of 1968, and subsequent increases in funding criminal justice development activities nationwide, merely served to crystallize a trend long established in the School at Michigan State.

In 1969 the School first began its Ph.D. program. The program was formally titled the Social Science Ph.D. with the Option in Criminal Justice and Criminology. It became one of the Ph.D. programs mounted by the "professional" schools in the College and was jointly administered by the College administration and the School. Enrollment was restricted to 10

students by College policy until its expansion to 25 in 1973, made possible by 406(e) funds.

The School participated in the President's Crime Commission activities by administering community relations field studies for the Police Task Force Report. The most discernible effect upon the School was not in terms of federal funding, for the School had always operated almost entirely on University-funded teaching positions, but rather in admissions and enrollment pressures generated by the national spotlight upon crime and social responses to crime. After more than 30 years of gradual and painstaking development of the program and modest annual growth, the School was confronted by all those who had newly discovered crime as a social problem and wanted to be part of the solution. Another effect was the increased competition for faculty and thus resulting inflated salary levels, a consequence of new developmental academic programs funded by OLEA and LEAA. Despite this rapid-fire proliferation of criminal justice programs across the country, the degree production at MSU showed a substantial growth up to 118 B.S. degrees each year and 36 master's degrees each year during this period. The criminal justice concept became firmly identified within the School in a name change (the third in its history) to the School of Criminal Justice (previous names had been Department of Police Administration, School of Police Administration, School of Police Administration and Public Safety). This period also witnessed some changes in composition of the faculty and student body which will be discussed later.

1972-1975 THIRD MAJOR CURRICULUM REVISION

During fall term 1972 a Curriculum Revision Committee was appointed to review and revise the bachelor's and master's degree curricula. The committee was chaired by Dr. Victor Strecher. Over the previous two years there had been sporadic efforts of varying intensity to examine certain parts of the curriculum and to modify others. This, however, was a concerted effort to bring about needed change within a prescribed time frame. Task forces were appointed for specific functions, and after an exhausting year of numerous conferences, the revision work culminated in a weekend meeting at Gull Lake, Michigan, where the School's Advisory Council debated, modified, and finally approved a curriculum program. The following year was consumed in shepherding the revised curricula through college and university committees to secure the approval of the University Academic Council. What remained was to develop a curriculum implementation plan during the early part of the 1974-1975 academic year. The first term of the newly approved curricula was winter 1975. Dr. Strecher was supported by 406(e) funds during the summer quarters of 1973, 1974, and 1975 and by the University during the school years in order to maintain work on the curriculum revision, especially at the master's level throughout the year.

During this period of intensive review and revision, it was, of course, business as usual in both the undergraduate and graduate programs. Enrollment levels and degree production

exceeded all previous levels. Bachelor's degrees were awarded at the rate of 281 each year, and 37 master's degrees were awarded each year during the 1972-1975 period.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

The program began modestly enough, but with administrative neatness and simplicity which are difficult to comprehend today. As stated earlier in this report, the "Police Administration Course" in 1935 was a byproduct of influences originating in the Michigan State Police and finding a ready response in Michigan State College at that time. The course offerings of this initial program were, as noted, modest and consisted of the following:

Police Administration 301	Police Science	3 credits
301. POLICE SCIENCE. Fall 3 (1-6)		

This course deals with such subjects as communications, finger prints, ballistics, and fire arms identification. It is given at the Michigan State Police Barracks. Mr. Bremer and technical staff of the Michigan State Police.

Police Administration 302	Police Science	3 credits
302. POLICE SCIENCE. Winter 3 (1-6)		

A continuation of Police Science 301. Police organization, public relations, and similar subjects are studied. Mr. Bremer and technical staff of the Michigan State Police.

Police Administration 303	Police Science	3 credits
303. POLICE SCIENCE. Spring 3 (3-0)		

A lecture course in which legal medicine, first aid, and radiology will be studied. Mr. Bremer and the technical staff of the Michigan State Police.

Police Administration 310 Criminal Law 3 credits

310. CRIMINAL LAW. Spring 3 (3-0)

This course is designed to acquaint the student with those phases of criminal law which are applicable to his work as a police officer or criminal investigator. Mr. Bremer and the lecturers from the Michigan Crime Commission.

Police Administration 411 Criminal Evidence 3 credits

411. CRIMINAL EVIDENCE. Fall 3 (3-0) Prerequisite: 310

A continuation of Criminal Law. The student will be trained in the collection and preservation of that evidence which is admissible in court. Mr. Bremer and lecturers from the Michigan Crime Commission.

The full catalog descriptions of these courses are included here because of their significance for the level of abstraction and the kind of conceptualization within the program of that time. In the recollection of Brandstatter, an enrollee in the program of 1935, a preponderance of the first three courses (301, 302, 303) related to skills and police procedural matters.² He commented that, prior to the 1946-1948 version of the program, virtually no public administration concepts had been included in the course work. It should be borne in mind that today's commonplace elements of police administration, traceable to O. W. Wilson's initial textbook, were still to be developed. The linkage of police administration and public administration clearly had not taken place. It is significant in this connection that MSC had not at that time offered courses in public administration--that police administration predated public administration on the Michigan State campus.

These five courses established the core of the police administration program between 1935 and 1946 when the first major curriculum revision began. There were additions, a general expansion of this major curriculum, during the next ten years; however, this core remained intact during the ten-year period. The courses and some of the influences they represented which were built into the program during those early years, 1939-1942, are discussed below.

The year 1939 may be regarded as most important for the future of the criminal justice program because of two courses added to the curriculum. Following are the catalog descriptions of those courses:

412. POLICE SCIENCE. Winter 3 (0-9)

Police organization and procedure is studied by giving the student practical experience in those fields. Technical staff of the Michigan State Police.

413. POLICE SCIENCE. Spring 3 (0-9)

A continuation of Police Science 412. The student participates in the various fields of police activity. Technical staff of the Michigan State Police.

This was the first mention in a Michigan State catalog of the Field Service Training Program which was later to be so educationally productive in the eyes of the School's graduates. Not content with exposing students to the instructors from the working world of the Michigan State Police, the program administrator provided this means of observing line operations under field conditions. The credit structure of that original

program is interesting in that students spent approximately three hours per week in the field for each credit. This ratio of field service hours to academic credits remained virtually unchanged over the years, later students serving a standardized 40 hours per week for a 12-credit enrollment in field service training.

Another course was added to the curriculum in 1940, Police Administration 220--Traffic Efficiency and Automobile Operation --2 credits; 1941 saw the addition of Police Administration 404 --Conservation Law Enforcement.

Thus, within its first ten years of operation, the School began with a basic curriculum of five courses and added four important courses between 1939 and 1942, providing for field service training, specialization in traffic, and specialization in conservation. All other police operations and the rudiments of police organization were taught in the original courses. Law was broadly comprehended in the two courses entitled Criminal Law and Criminal Evidence.

At this point it is appropriate to mention that this program was not, as often claimed, a highly vocational college degree program. First of all, it was located in the Division of Applied Science within Michigan State College. The departments of this division were Botany, Chemistry, Entymology, Geology, Physical Education, Physics, Physiology, and Zoology. A student enrolled in the original graduating class of 1938 would have completed 45 credits of Police Administration major

courses, 109 credits of nonmajor academic courses, and 47 credits in military science and physical education. The non-major courses included chemistry, 18 credits; anatomy and physiology, 14 credits; economics, 13 credits; English, 12 credits; mathematics, 9 credits; physics, 9 credits; and history, sociology, education, psychology, bacteriology, geography, and speech for a total of 52 credits--hardly an overly vocational or training-oriented program by any educational standards! The salient feature of the program, of course, was its heavy concentration upon the physical sciences: chemistry, anatomy, physics, mathematics. This was without doubt an expression of the program founders' view of the educated person--one well-grounded in the dominant scientific disciplines of the time.

As already mentioned, it did not require a long time to expand the five original courses into a steadily growing curriculum, one which was intended to be responsive to the needs of law enforcement of its time. The program grew rapidly from five to nine courses but remained at that level for the duration of World War II, when enrollment dropped dramatically. In 1946 Brandstatter, joined by Turner in 1947, began to examine the catalog of courses and almost immediately began making changes. These were of two broad kinds: (1) many of the arts and sciences nonmajor courses were specified for courses having a stronger relationship to police administration, and (2) "We began to bring to the campus some of the courses which had always been taught by the State Police" (Brandstatter, 1975).

Among the changes that occurred in the first catalog immediately after Brandstatter became an associate professor and assistant head of the program were those appearing in the 1946-48 MSC catalogs.

The courses numbered 301, 302, and 303 were changed from "Police Science" to "Police Administration." The catalog descriptions of these three courses included not only the names of state, local, and private organizations providing the course material but also the names of the police officials and private agency personnel directly involved.

A second major change in the course structure was that rather than having three hours of class meeting per week for the three-credit courses 301, 302, and 303, the credit structure was 3 (1-6) which indicates a more flexible, variable contact hour arrangement requiring more or less classroom attendance by students in conjunction with projects assigned by the guest instructors.

The two courses taught entirely on campus were 310 Criminal Law and 411 Criminal Evidence, both offered by the new associate professor, A. F. Brandstatter. The Field Service Training Program was expanded by one term, the sequence now including 412 Police Science (Fall, 1-16 credits), 413 Police Science (Winter, 1-16 credits), 414 Police Science (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer, 1-16 credits), and 416 Police Science (Summer, 1-16 credits).

The catalog listing also represented the change in credit structure and attendance requirements for field service training. Additional information contained in this expanded catalog was a complete listing of all of the federal, state, county, municipal, and private agencies which participated in field service training with the School.

These additions of courses and changes in titling and credit structure were merely the beginning of curricular development during this period. As seen in Chart 1, the 1946-1957 period was the time of greatest program expansion in the history of the School. Not only did the undergraduate curriculum move from 9 courses to 26 during this period, it was also joined by the master of science program inaugurated in 1956 and producing its first graduate in 1957. The extraordinary nature of this program expansion is seen best in the years 1949-1952 when 14 new courses were inaugurated within a three-year period. The program expansion of the entire period corresponded evenly with the faculty increase from one FTE to ten. However, the 1949-1952 course increase preceded the most dramatic faculty increase, which occurred between 1952-1957, when the faculty grew from five to ten.

As also indicated in Chart 1, after 1957 the program dimension at both B.S. and M.S. levels stabilized for a few years until 1963 when a curriculum revision effort (the second major program review) resulted in eight new courses and a restructuring of many of the retained courses. The 1960's saw an

almost continual change in the School's curricula, no program persisting for more than two or three years at a time. Courses were added and subtracted, modified, renamed, all contributing to an atmosphere of rapid and ongoing change. This was also a time of very high faculty turnover. During the decade following 1960, 17 new faculty members were employed, 18 employed previously and during that period left, and 2 died--all for a faculty averaging 11 full-time positions! This was also a period when a great many public administration-trained faculty came aboard, all certainly having an influence upon the direction of the program. It is apparent from Chart 1 that not only the nature of the program or the courses was at issue, but also the number of courses appropriate to the program.

The dramatic change in the master's program occurred between 1964 and 1966 when the course offerings doubled. A temporary reduction by 2 courses two years later lasted only a few years, when 20 new courses were added for a total of 32 in 1975, the year of the third major curriculum revision in the School's history. This same curriculum revision resulted in a reduction of undergraduate courses from 33 to 24.

In terms of course offerings as a dimension, the program has shown a strong growth trend since its inception, with a few years of dimensional stability. Courses have proliferated, major professional emphases have been modified, added, and dropped, but the general nature of the program has been one of growth and the accretion of new subjects to be taught and learned.

Chart 1

Number of Major Courses in MSU Catalog, By Year
1935-1975



One factor having a particular impact upon the nature of programming, the level of courses offered at various class levels--from freshman through senior--and the numbers of students reaching the School of Criminal Justice has been the recent emergence of community and junior colleges offering criminal justice programming. The School of Criminal Justice has always served a national and even international clientele, and thus the influences upon its programming have a wider scope than the State of Michigan.

However, there are within the State of Michigan 23 community colleges which offer criminal justice programs leading to associate degrees. Approximately 2000 students complete this program each year, of whom 50 percent (or 1000) intend to continue toward the bachelor's degree. Considering both the nature of the two-year programs and the very large numbers of potential applicants for the MSU program, the impact of this development has been very great. In terms of numbers, certainly there is new enrollment pressure upon the School. More importantly, the nature of the programming has given the School serious new issues with which to grapple. The major issue results from the transplanting of MSU programming into these community colleges which generate so many of the upper-school applications at MSU. Many of the faculty of the community colleges are graduates of the MSU School of Criminal Justice. It is only natural that they should model their curricula upon their academic experiences at MSU. For this

reason, a majority of the community college programs contain a goodly representation of the course materials covered in the baccalaureate program in the School of Criminal Justice.

These courses make up a sizeable part of the two-year educational experience of the students. What this means is that students applying for the School of Criminal Justice, having completed a two-year program already based upon the School's curriculum, come to the School with the majority of the junior and senior level courses already taken at the freshman and sophomore levels. Naturally, these courses do not have the same class level designations or numbering series and in most cases do not contain a congruent conceptual coverage of the material. However, the obvious problem of equating this two-year experience with the four-year program, the transferability of credits and courses, questions of waivering, questions of equivalents, and all other matters raised by the major issue of program proliferation create enormous difficulty in the relationship between the community colleges and the School of Criminal Justice at MSU.

At least part of the impetus for curriculum revision in the early 1970's and much of the thinking that guided the curriculum revision during the three years of the project was in relation to this new pressure for articulation of the MSU program with the community colleges of Michigan. One assumption was that the School should not cover the more elementary materials of criminal justice but should leave this to the

community colleges. Another was that the School should embark upon more advanced studies, more analytic work, indeed perhaps transferring much of its effort to the graduate level to avoid direct conflict with the community college programming. There was no implied criticism of community college programming in this position; instead, it was a matter of desiring not to duplicate already available resources more evenly distributed about the state but rather to do those things which the School is uniquely staffed, qualified, and funded to do and has the resources to accomplish--things not within the capacity of the community colleges. This was an explicit, conscious, and deliberate attempt to focus upon the most appropriate role and mission for the School of Criminal Justice.

II. FACULTY AND STUDENTS

FACULTY

PRIMARY PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OF FACULTY

Unlike most departments on a university campus, the School of Criminal Justice has recruited as much or more on the basis of professional experience than on the basis of formal academic degrees earned. Although academic degrees had a significant and changing relationship to the programming of the School through its development, the precise meaning of a degree has never been as clear in criminal justice in the selection of faculty as it has been in traditional disciplines where a long historical development has clearly established and standardized a means of preparation for each role in the educational sector. For this reason the selection of faculty has always presented an interesting process of considering both academic credentials and experiential credentials as qualifying factors for teaching positions.

Discussion of experiential background for the early years of the program would be confused if it did not include reference to the State Police officers as well as the on-campus faculty of the program. Beginning in 1935, for instance, Instructor Bremer (a lawyer) had experience primarily in the educational field and some responsibility for the campus security operations of that time. In this sense he did not have extensive experience in agencies of criminal justice.

However, the program was structured in such a way that the State Police command staff contributed substantial teaching time to the program, an important commitment by Commissioner Olander. A. F. Brandstatter, a member of the first graduating class, has described that early program as "largely skill- and police procedures-oriented as it was taught by Captains Mulbar, Hudson, Scavarda, and many other ranking officers in the State Police headquarters in East Lansing." Apparently Instructor Bremer taught the law-oriented courses and left the more substantive police-oriented courses to State Police officers. Dr. LeMoyne Snyder, a local medical-legal consultant to the State Police who had assisted in initiating the program, also taught a course in homicide investigation from the program's earliest days. Thus, the element of experience was injected into the program from resources external to the appointed faculty of the School between 1935 and 1945.

Beginning in 1946 the faculty of the School were obviously embarked on a course of becoming more self-sufficient with respect to criminal justice experience as well as academic credentials. During the 1946-1957 period, 5 of the 13 faculty had law enforcement experience at the federal, state, and municipal governmental levels. These same years saw the appointment of faculty with experience in the judiciary, correctional administration, juvenile justice, traffic administration and enforcement, the practice of law, security administration, and forensic science laboratory administration.

POLICIES RELATING TO FACULTY

INTERDISCIPLINARY FACULTY ARRANGEMENTS. At different times in its history, the School has had dual appointments with other teaching units of the University, notably the Department of Sociology within the College of Social Science and with the College of Education. Members of the faculty of the School have also taught within the Departments of Political Science, Sociology, and several other departments.

PART-TIME FACULTY MERITS AND PROBLEMS. The School has employed part-time faculty, always on a temporary basis, to teach courses because of sabbatical leave or faculty departures too sudden to permit filling the positions in the ordinary way. These part-time appointments have always been of short duration and few in number at any given time.

SHORT-COURSE AND EXTENSION TEACHING BY FACULTY. When the School maintained short-course training programs in connection with the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police and the University's Continuing Education College, there were staff--with minimal regular faculty duties--specifically appointed to teach the short courses, but most of the faculty taught both academic courses and short courses. All of the long-term faculty who were queried in regard to this arrangement had exceedingly

favorable comments about it. They agreed that faculty who taught both academic courses and short courses for police and correctional personnel were much better in both sectors, gaining from the experience in both kinds of classrooms. One comment was that they gained more than they gave in the short courses because of the impact upon their teaching in the academic courses.

HARD- AND SOFT-MONEY FACULTY POSITIONS. All positions in the history of faculty development have been hard-money positions with few exceptions. Over the years, of course, the School has employed temporary faculty on soft money. There have been grants from the state, from various foundations, and from the federal government; there has been special funding from the University from time to time which permitted the addition of a course or two and the employment of additional faculty. However, most positions were regular, budgeted, hard-money positions, all of which required the approval of the central University administration and the Board of Trustees. The bread-and-butter teaching activities of the School have never been made dependent upon soft-money positions because: 1) The vulnerability of this arrangement is all too apparent. The withdrawal of funding from all but University regular budgetary sources is palpable, has occurred from time to time elsewhere, and is destructive of program consistency if it occurs. 2) Building an

instructional program upon grants and other soft funds lends the program and its faculty to potential cooptation by the funding agency. This had happened notably in connection with atomic energy and aerospace programming at several fine universities.

For these reasons the School has never become dependent upon soft money for its regular teaching program. It has primarily attempted to use soft money to build research and support services. Such is the case with the LEAA educational development grant awarded to the School in July 1973.

STUDENTS

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL

Since in 1935, at the beginning of the program, Police Administration was an upper school program, naturally the students had to be classified as other than police administration students prior to their enrollment as juniors. The first three graduates came from the Division of Education; they were education majors in 1935 and completed their degrees in 1938. Table 1 indicates the pattern of enrollments over the years, with the very rapid increase of the program from 37 in 1935 to the early peak of 195 in 1938 and then the decline occasioned by the Depression and World War II. The postwar upsurge occurred and was followed by a steady increase to a peak during the early 1970's.

Table 1

Fall Term Enrollment of Majors in the School of
Criminal Justice from 1935 to 1975

<u>Year</u>	<u>Bachelor's</u>	<u>Master's</u>	<u>Ph.D.</u>
1935	37		
1936	86		
1937	113		
1938	195		
1939	168		
1940	138		
1941	93		
1942	107		
1943	11		
1944	4		
1945	18		
1946	130		
1947	129		
1948	133		
1949	161		
1950	204		
1951	219		
1952	253		
1953	279		
1954	288		
1955	375	2	
1956	368	12	
1957	382	20	
1958	341	24	
1959	334	24	
1960	353	21	
1961	335	17	
1962	333	21	
1963	366	28	
1964	331	22	
1965	348	58	
1966	354	70	
1967	326	70	
1968	322	56	
1969	393	90	1
1970	539	96	3
1971	826	87	7
1972	929	98	6
1973	707	89	6
1974	712	87	13
1975	855	125	20

It should be noted that the large proportionate increase in the last few years of graduate enrollments is due both to LEAA, LEEP, and 406(e) funding and to changes in the School's policy which place more emphasis on graduate level instruction. The enrollment figures underestimate graduate students actually working on degrees since many master's candidates are in-service criminal justice personnel who do not attend every quarter. The figures for the Ph.D. enrollment also underestimate enrollments since a number of Ph.D. candidates in the period after 1972 were not formally enrolled but were working on their dissertation research.

DEGREES AWARDED 1938-1975

Table 2 indicates the number of degrees awarded each year from the first graduating class of 1938 to 1975. It is clear that the graduating class of 1948 (19 students) consisted primarily of students who had interrupted their educations for service in World War II. This, in fact, was true of virtually all of the students who graduated through 1950, including both those who completed their final year or two of interrupted education and those who began immediately after World War II. The enormous leap in the number of degrees awarded between the 1966-1971 period and the 1972-1975 period is also so striking that it requires explanation. Most observers attribute this accelerated growth to the impact of the Safe Streets Act of 1968, the creation of LEAA, the availability of law enforcement education programming and LEEP funds, and the generally

Table 2
Degrees Awarded from 1938 to 1975

<u>Year</u>	<u>B.S. Degrees</u>	<u>M.S. Degrees</u>	<u>Ph.D. Degrees</u>
1938	3		
1939	19		
1940	17		
1941	23		
1942	17		
1943	25		
1944	3		
1945	0		
1946	2		
1947	18		
1948	19		
1949	26		
1950	31		
1951	46		
1952	48		
1953	52		
1954	74		
1955	36		
1956	73		
1957	65		
1958	75	1	
1959	96	1	
1960	70	2	
1961	80	0	
1962	96	5	
1963	69	10	
1964	125	12	
1965	93	40	
1966	89	30	
1967	102	26	
1968	119	40	
1969	121	25	
1970	107	29	
1971	170	63	
1972	196	34	3
1973	364	46	1
1974	280	36	1
1975	284	33	2

heightened awareness of crime and social response to crime during the years following the President's crime commission of 1966. The growth curve of the School might have accounted for an increase from about 115 graduates per year to just under 150 graduates per year--but not the 280 graduates averaged between 1972 and 1975.

On the other hand, the master's degree program, which graduated fewer than 10 students each year between 1958 and 1965, grew to just under 40 in the 1966-1971 period and showed a very modest increase between 1971 and the present.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS, SCHOLARS, AND VISITORS

Among the many influences which have shaped the programming of the School have been the very large number of international students, scholars, and visitors to the School over the years. The first bachelor of science degree in police administration awarded to a foreign student at Michigan State was in 1942. This student, who entered the School in 1939, was the first of more than 500 students and police officials from every sector of the world who came to the School of Criminal Justice for one reason or another over the next 36 years. Summarized data about international visitors to the School is contained in Table 3, showing that 504 people from 62 nations came to the School between 1939 and 1975. Although distribution of nations among the regions of the world is remarkably even, the number of individual participants from each region varies from under 7 percent to over 35 percent.

Table 3

	<u>No. of Nations</u>	<u>No. of Persons</u>	<u>% of Total Persons</u>
Europe	10	89	17.7
Asia	12	180	35.7
Africa	13	63	12.5
Middle East	11	89	17.7
Latin America	10	49	9.7
British Commonwealth	<u>6</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>6.7</u>
	62	504	100.0

In addition to the impact upon the School's programming resulting from the visits of these 504 international police officials and students, the impact of the School upon the nations represented by these visitors must be considered. Although it would be arrogant to assume that the School substantially modified the direction of criminal justice philosophy or operations in any of the 62 countries represented, it is reasonable to assume that the visitors and students became aware of the activities of the School, viewed with varying degrees of interest the kinds of courses and programs offered by the School, and were influenced to some extent in their perspectives and perceptions of criminal justice education and human resource development in the widest possible sense. It is significant that a very large number of the countries represented sent visitors over an extended number of years, in some cases spanning one or two decades. Where this has

occurred, it can be assumed that more than casual interest in the School's programming resulted from the earlier visits and that continued interaction with the School was an indication of a growing perception of the role of higher education in the development of criminal justice agencies and their operations.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

LOCATION OF PROGRAM

The original name of the School of Criminal Justice was the "Police Administration Course." It was located in the Division of Applied Sciences of Michigan State College. The implication of the title and the academic base was that it was indeed an applied science (as distinguished from the social sciences or liberal arts). The administrative location of the program was changed in 1944 when it was moved into the College of Business and Public Service. The next program title change occurred in the middle 1950's when it became the School of Police Administration and Public Safety to better reflect its widening coverage of the criminal justice field. By that time, of course, it included not only police administration but also forensic science, crime prevention, traffic administration, correctional administration, and industrial security administration. The final administrative location change occurred in 1963 when the School was moved to the College of Social Science. This resulted not only from a perception of the School's most appropriate academic base but also from a University reorganization which resulted in a substantial realignment of teaching units. There was at that time and has continued to be some discussion about the desirability of having a college devoted primarily to the applied social sciences as distinguished from the disciplines. One feature of the School's new location was the distinction between academic and professional programs.

For instance, the schools included police administration and public safety, social work, labor and industrial relations; departments included sociology, psychology, political science, geography, and anthropology.

Finally, the name of the School was once again modified, this time to its present form, the School of Criminal Justice, in 1971. This name change was considered to reflect the rich diversity of the programming available within the School and was thought to be the best expression of the educational content of the programs and their relationship to the working organizations of criminal justice. It might be added that this name change also reflected a set of forces operating within the School which eventuated in the large-scale curriculum revision of the 1972-1975 period.

INTEGRATION OF THE SCHOOL INTO THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

Like almost all new academic programs, the criminal justice field has faced its share of obstacles from the traditional university disciplines. Under the title of Police Administration, the School had some particularly abrasive difficulties to overcome. The police were, after all, an undereducated occupational group; they represented a form of governmental authority which was explicitly and overtly disliked by many faculty members. All prior preparation for police officers had been "training" rather than education and thus inappropriate on a college campus, and most citizens--including faculty members--have so simplistic a notion of the duties of police

officers that they could see no earthly reason for moving the manpower development process onto the university campus. The few persons who understood the delicate and difficult social mission of law enforcement had considerable missionary work ahead of them as they embarked upon the new program. Turner's view of the process of becoming integrated into the university fabric has a point of some interest to it. He pointed out that "acceptance by the larger faculty community never concerned me. . . . The important goal was for the School of Criminal Justice to set forth a clear-cut program, do a good job, and acquire professional friends on the basis of what it accomplished. . . . I was never interested in currying favor just to become respectable with other disciplines. If we are a professional program we'll be recognized as such on the merits of what we do."³ This statement, of course, bears a close resemblance to one sociological position on professionalism which regards it as an ascribed status established by observers rather than those in the occupation. But despite Turner's attitude toward the integration of the School into the University community, many faculty members who came aboard over the years were vitally concerned about this question. They sought closer ties with faculty of other schools, and the School did become more closely associated with other units scattered across the campus. In the very early days of the program, Turner engaged in several cooperative research projects with faculty members of other departments, thereby establishing a

network of professional associations which has endured to the present. Scott engaged in widespread professional and social activities which brought the School to the attention of other disciplines in professional schools. The program's director, Brandstatter, had early embarked upon a constant effort to develop ties across the campus between the School and a large variety of other disciplines and programs.

Perhaps the greatest impetus for academic integration came as more faculty came aboard having a traditional academic identification. That is, faculty having advanced degrees, having observed the conduct and interactions of the more traditional faculties, came to desire similar patterns of behavior in interdisciplinary relationships for the School. Some members of the faculty have viewed this desire and the resultant behavioral patterns negatively, while others have regarded it as an essential part of the School's development and eventual assimilation into Michigan State University and, more particularly, into the College of Social Science. It is worth noting that there is a wide division of perceptions and interpretations on this question, rather than a uniform opinion that the pattern has been good and fruitful for the School.

PROGRAM GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Since its inception the School has functioned under what might be termed a strong leadership pattern rather than the more democratically oriented elected leader format. Several reasons may be suggested for this pattern: 1) Criminal justice

is a new field without the comfortable peer relationships established among long-time uniformly educated faculty who merely want to go about their research, teaching, and professional activities. 2) Numerically not very many faculty have been qualified--both experientially and academically--to teach, much less to lead, academic programs in criminal justice. 3) Many programs have not yet progressed beyond the leadership of one of their incumbent department heads. 4) The distinction between a professional school and an academic discipline is still a thorny issue in criminal justice, with no promise of easy resolution.

Although the School of Criminal Justice has had three directors, its incumbent director has served 29 years under a succession of deans, academic vice-presidents, and two University presidents. Rather than having served in the pattern of the popular elected academic chairman whose role is to merely facilitate the professional work of his colleagues, the director of the School of Criminal Justice has served in a leadership role, having developed the School through all but its initial phase. He has overseen all three major curriculum revisions and has managed the appointments of 48 out of 50 faculty who have served the School. Of the 3,566 B.S. and M.S. graduates of the School, he has presided over the graduation of all but 109 degree completions.

And yet, despite this long continuous tenure of the incumbent director of the School, the administrative style and

governance of the School have been greatly modified over the past several years. According to all long-term observers, the governance process has been greatly democratized in the sense of including larger numbers of faculty, students, and staff in the decision process. The University has fostered movement toward democratized form of leadership, even while demanding that the constitutional requirements of accountability be maintained--a somewhat awkward arrangement for those who manage instructional units. Observers note that in the early days decision making was highly centralized, with perhaps a very brief consideration of the opinions of others. By contrast, recently the School was one of the first teaching units on campus to incorporate students into the decision process by granting them student organizational voting privileges in the School's Advisory Council and the Faculty Advisory Committee. The director of the School consults with senior faculty on matters of tenure, reappointments, and other personnel matters; he consults with the Faculty Advisory Committee on virtually all issues of policy and School governance; issues thought by the director and by the Faculty Advisory Committee to merit attention are brought before the full School Advisory Council, which includes faculty, staff, and student participation. The management of specific parts of the program, such as the undergraduate curriculum, the master's curriculum, the Ph.D. curriculum, faculty search, and other functions, are delegated to coordinators who are also teaching faculty members. These

coordinators are free to assemble ad hoc committees to discuss particularly thorny questions which may arise in connection with their duties. Issues which cannot be resolved by coordinators with ad hoc committees and in consultation with the director can and are brought before the Faculty Advisory Committee and the School Advisory Council for their attention. In this way the School governance process has become one of relative openness and high visibility, even though the authority and responsibility of the administrator of the School, the director, has remained undiluted by University regulation and requirement of accountability.

CONTINUED

2 OF 4

IV. THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS CENTER

INTRODUCTION

The School of Criminal Justice through a number of discussions with LEAA staff beginning in 1969 with William Caldwell (then head of the LEAA Office of Academic Assistance) had been involved extensively in the development of the notion of LEAA funding of "Centers of Excellence." These discussions continued over the years through the formulation and reformulation of the program objectives and guidelines. Concept papers and grant applications were submitted as required by LEAA and ultimately, in July 1973, the School was awarded funding for graduate educational development activities under section 406(e) of the enabling legislation for LEAA.

The final proposal placed a heavy emphasis on the development of a research center which would serve to strengthen the School's research activities. It was thought that such a mechanism would generate a good deal of research concerning manpower issues in criminal justice. The Director of the School, Professor A. F. Brandstatter, appointed Dr. John H. McNamara project director and authorized the creation of the Criminal Justice Systems Center to handle the LEAA educational grant and to serve generally as the research arm of the School. Dr. McNamara was appointed head of the Center and has served as such since its inception.

In addition to research, the proposal also concerned itself with educational development and technology transfer.

Underlying was the assumption that the three functions to be served by the grant would be substantively undergirded by a concern with systemic level matters in the field of criminal justice. As will be seen later, this focus altered considerably during the course of the development of the Center. In retrospect a number of factors can be identified which influenced a shift away from an almost exclusive concern with systemic level matters into a wide variety of research, instructional, and technology transfer functions.

Concurrent with this shift was the merging of these three functions into each of a number of relatively discrete projects and activities. Priorities were assigned to projects or activities where some payoff was perceived in all three functions. Center staff came to see projects as having more value when they could serve a merging of the three functions. This type of merging of the functions will be clearly apparent in the Wayne County Sheriff's Department Project and the summer graduate research internships developed and supervised by the Center's staff.

Ultimately the Center's activities placed great emphasis on the involvement, in almost all stages of each project or activity, of graduate students as research assistants or as students enrolled in regular graduate courses or independent study courses. Simultaneously, the Center staff consciously sought to develop a broader set of research linkages with operational and planning agencies in the field of criminal

justice. This expansion of research linkages was and is seen as a necessary ingredient for the successful completion of research by graduate students whether the projects involved were initiated by the Center or by others in the University.

Prior to the expanded research activities for the School, it was necessary to obtain approval for an expanded maximum number of Ph.D. candidates enrolled in the program. The program, begun in 1969, was one component program of four within the College of Social Science. The College offers the Social Science Ph.D. with four options in the professional Schools in the College: Labor and Industrial Relations, Urban Planning, Social Work, and Criminal Justice. At the time of the inception of each of the options a limitation of 10 students enrolled in each option was the College policy. To expand the option in Criminal Justice and Criminology, it was first necessary to set an upward limit of 25 and then pursue the mechanisms by which this expansion would be allowed. The College proposed that the School, in effect, pay for the expansion from the grant funds. The College administration took the position that each student in an interdisciplinary program not only costs the School money to process through the program but also costs other academic units in terms of faculty resources. This position was accepted by the School, and a formula was developed predicated on the fact that student tuition only pays for one-third of the educational resources provided the student. After some negotiations with the LEAA

Comptroller's Office, these grant expenditures were approved and the expansion to 25 Ph.D. candidates formally approved. The School then began a national advertising campaign through the use of brochures and news announcements to recruit the most qualified students it could. It was not, however, until the fall 1975 quarter that we achieved the maximum allowable enrollment in the Ph.D. program. This fact had some cogent implications for the use of graduate students in projects developed by the Center. It meant that students in the master's program were the major source of student research involvement through a large part of the grant period.

THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL AND SUBSEQUENT CHANGES

The proposal upon which the grant was awarded was extremely broad in scope and indicated a number of directions which the Center might take after having explored the feasibility of each of the directions. For example, it was indicated that the Center would explore the possibility of graduate criminal justice education off campus in a type of "campus-without-walls" effort. The proposal also placed a great deal of stress on developing human resources in such a (unspecified) fashion that persons graduating from the School would serve to further the integration of the criminal justice system. We also stated that some exploration would take place regarding the development of a model state master plan for criminal justice education.

After some initial explorations, it was decided not to pursue the development of a model master plan for criminal justice education since a number of existing models were discovered and the costs of improving these models appeared excessive. Similarly, development of graduate education in a campus-without-walls mode was stopped due to the obvious excessive costs of what would have amounted to tutorial instruction. The School also was discouraged from expanding its master's program in the Detroit metropolitan area due to some difficulties arising at the higher administrative levels of the University and Wayne State University.

As indicated earlier, the focus of research activity was the involvement of graduate students in applied or problem-solving research in criminal justice agencies. As the project developed, this focus became enlarged to include more students and more agencies in a variety of types of substantive research. In support of individual research projects the Center developed a research consultation service for graduate students enrolled not only in the School of Criminal Justice but also in other academic units such as Sociology, Political Science, Psychology, Geography, Education, and others. Students were given assistance on their own course projects, master's theses, and Ph.D. dissertations as well as projects developed by the Center.

The research consultation service consisted of a variety of types of assistance. Students were aided in conceptualizing their research problems, designing the projects, data collection efforts, computer analysis, and interpretation of findings.

Although all the senior staff of the Center were involved to some degree in this service, as were some graduate assistants in the Center, the bulk of this service was provided by the Research Director, Dr. Ralph G. Lewis, and advanced graduate students assigned to the service.

Concurrently, a research internship program was developed and students were assigned to a wide range of criminal justice agencies to assist those agencies in conducting needed research. Most of these internships were of relatively short duration--usually three months--and were focused on delimited research problems. To support these internships, graduate research fellowships were utilized in some cases, and course credit was awarded upon completion of the internship research. Additional funding was received from specific agencies to support other internships.

The Center also developed a few long-range projects in which students could receive needed experiential learning in applied research. These were projects with a fairly large scope which could serve as sources of data for a variety of theses, dissertations, and class assignments. Prominent among these was a collaborative action/research project with the Wayne County Sheriff's Department (the Detroit Metropolitan Area). The project began with a simple request from Sheriff William Lucas to have a graduate student rewrite the Department's policy manual. After exploratory discussions with the Sheriff and his staff, it became clear that far more was needed

than a simple writing exercise. Center staff, in conjunction with staff of the Department, saw the opportunity for a long-range effort to develop policy at all levels of the Department and to begin to develop the Department's ability to continue the process of policy development and refinement. Under the primary direction of Dr. John Hudzik, Center staff conducted a number of surveys of the Department and identified issues of relevance to policy development. After these findings were reported to the Department, a task force made up jointly of key personnel in the Department and staff from the Center was created and undertook the policy development task which eventuated in a new departmental manual. Systems Center staff and graduate students in the School are, and will continue, monitoring the implementation of the new policy manual with a view to evaluating its effects on the organization.

On the instructional side, a number of graduate classes were involved in the review of the survey results and the writing of the policy manual. Three separate classes in Policy Development in Law Enforcement, taught by Dr. Larry Hoover, were so involved and produced approximately 1,000 pages of written material for the consideration of the task force. Similarly, a course in Correctional Management given by David Kalinich was involved in the writing of a jailor training manual which was largely implemented by the Department.

This project is still active at this time, and its success can be partially assessed by the fact that Sheriff Lucas has submitted a grant application to LEAA which would allow

for the continued heavy involvement in the Department of the Center's staff and graduate students from the School.

A second long-range project consisted of a number of interrelated projects having to do with women in criminal justice. Initially this project began with a request from the Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency to assist its Director, Ms. Meredith Taylor, in helping the Michigan Department of Corrections to begin planning for programming for female offenders who would be incarcerated in a new facility under construction by the Department. The Center staff accepted the request and assisted in the creation of a task force made up of interested citizens. The plan was to have the task force serve as an advisory body to the Michigan Corrections Commission. In turn, the Center would undergird the efforts of the task force by providing research findings from an analysis of departmental computer tapes and by providing relevant literature searches for the task force. A lengthy bibliography was developed along with several critical reviews of the literature in the form of theses and reports.

An opportunity was also afforded the Center to examine the Michigan State Police fingerprint files of female arrestees dating back to 1917. This examination was undertaken with two objectives--to conduct a trend analysis of arrests and dispositions and to make some projections for the future. These data provided the base for a thesis and are presently being analyzed and a preliminary report being written.

One of the major difficulties encountered by the Center staff was that, although a number of the staff and other faculty of the School became members of the task force, the MSU representatives were all males and the remainder of the task force were females. Since none of the School members were interested in changing their sex, the problem of their credibility in a relatively activist group of females became paramount and was never resolved to the complete satisfaction of all parties involved. Nevertheless, a good deal of data and other material were provided to the task force, and a national Delphi study of wardens of women's prisons, of administrators of departments of corrections, and of legislators on state judiciary committees was conducted. This study focused on the future of programming for women offenders and is presently being written up both as a Center product and as a thesis.

The project was initially entered into, to a great extent, due to the interest of the Center's staff in systemic level research in criminal justice. The project was seen as one which would allow for the assessment of the extent to which one could say that a female justice system existed akin to the popular distinction between the criminal justice system and the juvenile justice system. It offered an opportunity to look at a more circumscribed number of individuals and actions that made up a network of interdependent actions and reactions. As the project unfolded, however, concern turned more to increasing the involvement of students, regardless of their

theoretical approach to the issues surrounding the female offender. Some additional funding was sought from the National Institute of Mental Health Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency for the project, and Center staff were encouraged to submit a formal grant application but have not as yet done so.

At the same time that the Center became involved in researching women offenders, it also began to concern itself with women in police work as a result of a request from Officer Sue Brown, the President of the Women in Police in Michigan. This request was one to survey all the women in policing in the state and to construct a profile of how women were being deployed and utilized by local and state law enforcement agencies. The survey was designed and implemented by Center staff and revealed a number of unanticipated results which formed the basis for a number of discussions with the members of the Michigan Women in Police. Along with other data and literature, it also formed the basis for a proposed series of orientation seminars for women interested in entering the field of law enforcement.

The Center is continuing its concern for women in police in a response to Colonel George Halverson, Director of the Michigan State Police. Colonel Halverson has asked for an assessment of women on patrol in his department and has provided partial funding for that effort which is just getting under way at the time of this writing.

RESEARCH INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

As the Center developed and continued to refine its objectives, a heavier emphasis was placed on student involvement in research not only on the major projects of the Center but also on short-range projects where some assistance from the Center was requested. As the Center became better known to both faculty and students in the University and to agencies in the state, more and more requests for experience and for assistance began to flow into the Center. Ultimately, the Center became defined as having a brokerage function for the placement of research interns in operational criminal justice agencies.

Thus, the Center began to acquire an instructional service in addition to the research consultation service and in addition to the formal courses offered by the staff of the Center. A number of research internships were developed by the Center in such agencies as the State Supreme Court Administrator's Office, the Michigan Office of Criminal Justice Programs, the Michigan Department of Corrections, and other agencies on what was initially an ad hoc basis. Students were recruited primarily from the School of Criminal Justice for such agency internships, but other graduate students were also recruited from departments such as Political Science, Geography, Psychology, and Human Ecology. Center staff came to see these internships as adding an experiential learning aspect to the development of research skills in graduate students as well as an expanded set of relations with local, state, and federal agencies.

On the basis of early experience with these research internships, it was decided to mount a systematic effort in the summer of 1975 in order to assess more carefully the value of these internships to both the students and the agencies involved. The Center also attempted to evaluate how well the Center administered these internships from the perspectives of the interns and the agencies. Finally, we attempted to assess the degree to which the research products were utilized by the agencies. A total of 15 students worked during that summer on 13 different projects in 11 separate agencies. Dr. Lewis met on a regular basis with the interns during their assignments to these agencies and led discussion on the experiences interns were having in their agency assignments. He also met on a regular basis with agency liaison personnel who were supervising the work of the interns in the agencies. Discussions were not confined to specific technical or methodological issues but more often had to do with the "politics of research." By this is meant the many issues that arise in the conduct of research that coursework or textbooks on research methods rarely touch upon. Among these were the problems of being an outsider, the difficulties of clearly defining research objectives and setting realistic goals, the problems of not interfering with the ongoing activities of the agencies, and myriad other issues.

In order to support research interns in this program, two major extrinsic incentives were used. LEAA graduate research fellowships were awarded to student interns, and course

credits were awarded in some instances where students did additional work other than that required by the basic program. Probably the most telling lesson that was derived from the total internship program was that it required the full-time participation of a faculty member to achieve the goals of the individual students and agencies. That is, it was a drain on the professional manpower of the Center. The total costs have not been computed as of this writing, but Center staff intend to attempt to develop a less costly model for the program and implement it in the future. On the other hand, the benefits to students, the School, and operational agencies appear to justify the effort. For example, all of the students feel that the internship experience increased their ability to perform productive agency-related research. In fact, four of the interns have obtained employment as a result of, and directly related to, their internship experience. Moreover, there has been an increase in the number of agencies expressing a desire to participate in such a program. In fact, one agency was so impressed with the internship program that it gave the Center a grant to provide five research interns during the academic year 1975-76.

THE PROBLEM OF CREATING A "TRACK RECORD" AND SIMULTANEOUSLY ENSURING CONTINUED FUNDING FOR THE CENTER

One major problem that plagued the Center from its inception had to do with finding a compromise between delivering a number of educational and research products and producing new grant funds which would ensure the continued existence of the

Center beyond the expiration of the LEAA Educational Development Grant. The Center fluctuated continually between 1) gaining closure on its varied activities sponsored by the grant and 2) the development of concept papers or grant applications for additional funding from a variety of funding sources.

The development of concept papers and grant applications, as anyone with experience in grantsmanship realizes, is not simply a matter of writing up a work program and costing it out, but is one of many and varied negotiations and communications with funding sources. At the same time, in order to increase the chances of securing such funding, the Center had to demonstrate that it could successfully follow through on a newly funded project by pointing to its past record of accomplishments.

A related problem was that of deciding which audiences would be judging the accomplishments of the Center. The first most obvious audience was and is LEAA staff. Because the Center focused on applied research of utility to students and particular agencies, it did not expend much of its resources on getting publications in the usual professional journals. Most of the Center's products hence were shared with LEAA in the form of attachments to quarterly reports or reports requested by LEAA staff.

Other audiences were the other universities in the Consortium. Although most products of the Center were not of general interest, some were, and these were shared with the

other universities. Similarly, the Center worked on given projects with the other universities such as the survey of potential employers of graduate students completing their studies. A number of papers were also prepared for formal presentation at meetings and conferences of the Consortium universities. Some of these eventually formed the basis for grant applications or for publication, but most of these papers were simply for the consideration of the other Consortium universities.

With the election of Dr. McNamara as Chairperson of the Consortium Board of Directors and of Dr. Lewis as Chairperson of the Research Directors group, it became necessary for Center staff not only to represent the Center but also the Consortium as well. Although flattered by the honor of filling these offices, Center staff found that frequently they had to take positions as incumbents of these offices which were not entirely consistent with the interests of the Center. At times these positions were consistent, however, and led to furthering the interests of the Center. A case in point is a presentation made at an executive board meeting of the National Association of State Criminal Justice Planning Administrators regarding the role the Consortium might play in the developing national strategy of LEAA program evaluation. This presentation allowed for the development of ties between Center staff and LEAA staff involved in the implementation of the evaluation strategy. It allowed the Center to stay abreast of the LEAA effort and to become alerted to potential

involvement in the national effort. Ultimately, this was to lead to an award from the Michigan Office of Criminal Justice Programs (OCJP) of a contract to work on a Model Evaluation Program grant received by the Office. Center staff worked with OCJP staff on the preparation of the grant application submitted to LEAA and presently are implementing the program.

Another significant audience was and is the remainder of the MSU criminal justice faculty. Since most of the Center projects were of a short-range nature and were aimed at heavy student involvement, there was not an extensive involvement of the remainder of the faculty in these projects. The Center was not completely successful in communicating its activities to those faculty not involved, and its relative lack of visibility resulted in the judgment on the part of some of the faculty that the Center was accomplishing less than it should. It also led to such awkward circumstances as a case where one member of the instructional faculty of the School had independently prepared a grant application in response to an RFP for which the Center was also preparing a response. This did little to endear the Center to that particular faculty member. The faculty were generally informed of the Center's activities via monthly reports at faculty meetings, but such reports were models of brevity and did not serve sufficiently to inform those faculty not involved with the Center of its activities. In retrospect this problem was one of the major failings of the Center.

Of course, many other audiences existed for the Center such as the University administration, fiscal personnel in the University and fiscal personnel in LEAA, other criminal justice programs than the Consortium programs, operational agencies, and the like. The Center's staff was aware of these audiences and their views of the Center to some degree and was sensitive to the varying perspectives by which the Center's activities were being judged. This did not, however, entirely resolve the basic issue of establishing a track record in research while simultaneously doing the necessary developmental work to prepare new grant applications and secure funding which would continue the fiscal support for the Center's activities beyond the expiration of the LEAA grant. Although many of the activities of the Center obviously served both objectives, many other activities were in conflict with one another, and compromises between the two objectives constantly had to be made, resulting in a good deal of work never reaching fruition.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL AND PHYSICAL LOCUS OF THE CENTER

The Center was created as a subunit of the School of Criminal Justice and had no formal identity apart from that of the School. Office space was provided in a building other than that which houses the offices of the School. Although the space provided the Center was necessary and more than adequate, it created a problem regarding informal communication with both faculty and students in the School. Center staff were aware that a number of graduate students had only a dim realization

of the existence of the Center and that a number of faculty and students perceived the Center as conducting its own business independent of the remainder of the School. This, at a point in time when agonizing over the problem, prompted one of the Center's staff members to suggest facetiously that the Center be renamed "McNamara's Raiders."

This problem was eventually greatly reduced by the contact between Center staff and other faculty and students in the research consultation service. The problem was also somewhat reduced by the creation of an advisory committee for the Center made up of criminal justice faculty members and chaired by Director Brandstatter. The activities of the Center were shared with this committee, and problems of the Center were discussed along with policies which governed the Center. This committee helped also to familiarize with the Center the six new faculty members appointed during the period of the grant.

The Center began with two faculty members appointed to the Center: Dr. Larry Hoover and Dr. John McNamara as Assistant Coordinator and Coordinator respectively. The Research Director, Dr. Ralph Lewis, was not appointed until January of 1974. During the second year of the Center's existence, Dr. Hoover transferred full time into the instructional program and was ultimately replaced by Dr. John K. Hudzik. The fact that Lewis and Hudzik were new to the School meant that they had to establish a number of new relationships with faculty members. Compounding this problem was the fact that six new faculty members joined the faculty during the existence of the

Center. Relationships had to be developed with each of these faculty members on an individual basis to find where their personal interests and the interests of the Center were compatible and where they were not.

Another set of relations developed around the administration of the Ph.D. program and around the awarding of fellowships and graduate assistantships. Center staff had the responsibility for administering the LEAA graduate research fellowships awarded to the School in connection with the 406(e) grant. A committee jointly made up of instructional and Center faculty designed policies regarding the fellowships and reviewed applications from graduate students for these fellowship awards. Similarly, a committee of Center and instructional faculty reviewed applications for the Ph.D. program. This allowed for more interaction and exchange of ideas than otherwise would have been possible.

The awarding of assistantships and fellowships is an interesting example also of the separation of the Center from the formal instructional program. Graduate assistantships, as in most programs, are used both to create resources for the program and to provide financial assistance to graduate students. The School did not have any policy with respect to the allocation of assistantships at the M.S. and Ph.D. levels. Center staff, being more concerned with the Ph.D. program, were more inclined to award assistantships at that level. Frequently, disagreements would arise regarding which students should be awarded assistantships and would take some time to resolve.

The LEAA fellowships also in a few instances created problems for the instructional program. A number of fellowships were awarded to outstanding graduate students at the Ph.D. level who had been serving well as graduate assistants in the instructional program. Although the recipients of the fellowships greatly benefited personally from the fellowships, this created a problem of replacing them as graduate assistants. Similarly, the Center was interested in having Ph.D. students assigned to the Center as research assistants, and many students preferred working on research projects rather than as teaching assistants. Some conflicts were generated in the competition for these students but were ultimately resolved by a variety of strategies. Among these was the offering of an experimental research methods course by one of the research assistants in the Center.

In all, the present locus of the Center in the overall program of the School seems to have stabilized. A plan is being developed whereby faculty can be rotated between the formal instructional program and the Center. It is anticipated that this will integrate the Center and the instructional program more effectively than has been the case in the past.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS IN THE UNIVERSITY

Although a good many relations existed between the School and other schools and departments in the University at the time the School created the Center, the Center attempted to create more relations with faculty and students from other units in

the University. At first the Center, having received University-wide publicity, received a number of requests from faculty and students for direct financial assistance in a variety of ongoing or planned projects which were only distantly related to the major objectives of the Center. A good deal of time was spent with some faculty from other units who perceived the Center as a funding agency. Much of this time was necessary in that Center staff wanted to function in a spirit of collegiality with other faculty and students but could not justify the use of grant funds for a variety of projects which were not central to the objectives of the Center. Often Center staff, while not committing any grant funds directly to other faculty, would provide assistance in preparing grant applications and in getting the grant applications to what appeared to be the most probable funding source for the grant application. The same assistance was provided to faculty and students in the School of Criminal Justice where their proposed projects were only distantly related to the objectives of the Center.

As time progressed and the staff became clearer about the priorities of the Center, it was possible to develop a number of working relations with other academic units in the University. One such example is the set of relations that developed with the Computer Institute for Social Science Research. Center and Institute staff worked on a major proposal involving the computer analysis of data on stress in police work gathered by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

The proposal was submitted as a joint effort between the Center and the Institute. Graduate students from criminal justice were also assigned to work with the Institute as part-time instructors in computer usage courses. Center staff also worked with the Institute on the adaptation of the JUSSIM simulation of Alfred Blumstein and associates to the MSU computer, and data were later gathered from the local area for use in the JUSSIM exercise. The JUSSIM program subsequently was used in formal courses by a number of faculty other than those of the Center.

The Center was also instrumental in finding a placement in the Michigan State Police Department for a Ph.D. candidate from the Geography Department. This student assisted greatly in the development of a new geo-coding of crime in the state. This work eventuated in the development of a proposal from the faculty of the Geography Department to the State Police to expand this work.

Center staff also worked on funded projects obtained by other units in the University. The School of Labor and Industrial Relations sought out Center staff to develop a training program in crime analysis for state planning agency and regional planning units personnel. The Center developed the program and brought in Alfred Blumstein to describe and demonstrate the JUSSIM simulation of systemic relations in criminal justice.

A good deal of time was given to joint explorations with the Political Science Department concerning the development of a criminal justice data bank similar to that of the Political

Science Consortium data archives. Discussions continued for a number of months but were discontinued when it became obvious that LEAA was anticipating awarding grants to other universities and research organizations for the development and utilization of criminal justice data banks.

The Center also worked jointly on some projects with the College of Urban Development. One such project was the evaluation of "mini-stations" in the Detroit Police Department. The Center staff put together a bibliography on team policing and extracted major issues from the literature for the use of the researchers in the College of Urban Development. Dr. Lewis also served as a member of a steering committee for a one-day national workshop implemented by the College on the nature and causes of crime and violence.

A number of relations of less duration or scope developed with other academic units such as the College of Communications and were to provide mutually supportive activities for both the Center and these other units. Primarily these focused around fiscal or conceptual support for graduate students interested in researching crime and criminal justice topics. Nine fellowships were awarded to such students in support of thesis and dissertation research. Six of these were successfully completed, and the remaining three are in progress.

SUMMARY

The Center has made significant contributions to the graduate program of criminal justice at MSU. The LEAA funds

which made possible the creation of the Center allowed for a greatly enriched set of research experiences for students in the graduate programs. New research courses were developed at the master's level, and courses were offered in research at the doctoral level. New relations were established with a number of operational agencies and old relations expanded. A revised master's curriculum was implemented during the period of the grant and a preliminary evaluation of the curriculum completed.

Since the grant was developmental in nature, substantial effort was given to exploratory activities which never resulted in clear-cut products. Similarly, considerable time was spent in attempting to establish objectives and priorities for the Center which were consonant with the expanded Ph.D. program and with the interests of individual students in the program. The Center never was completely successful in effecting a pure emphasis on systemic level issues in criminal justice, either in research or in the instructional program. It now is clear that the Center was overly ambitious in its goals relevant to systemic level issues. Faculty, students, and operational agencies are generally more concerned with one specific component of the system. Apparently the forces which make for a lack of integration of the criminal justice system also operate within academic programs of criminal justice, causing them to resemble microcosms of the larger operational world of criminal justice.

Although the underlying proposed focus of the Center on systemic level issues had to be abandoned in favor of more component-focused research, the research still stands as a valuable set of experiences for the faculty, students, and agencies involved. The Center now stands at a juncture where it has received some future fiscal support from the College of Social Science, from the School of Criminal Justice, and from sources outside the University. The Center has not received national recognition as such, but its value to graduate research education and the development and maintenance of ties with the operational field of criminal justice has been demonstrated. While the continued existence of the Center is not a question, the scope of its activities remains unclear. Whether the Center will become a poignant memory or will continue to maintain its vitality after having gone through its growing pains is a question which must be answered in a future document.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Fagan, Leon, "Evolution of Police Administration Course" in Contact, Alpha Phi Sigma, E. Lansing, 1949
2. Interview with A. F. Brandstatter, 7/22/75
3. Interview with Ralph Turner, 7/21/75

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
PROGRAM HISTORY

By
Norman Rosenblatt

The stated purpose of the 406(e) Educational Development Grant was the development or strengthening of graduate programs in the area of criminal justice. At Northeastern University it was decided to emphasize the field of forensic science. This decision was based on the perceived needs in the criminal justice system and the basic strengths at the University. It was determined by the Administration of the College of Criminal Justice that, within a three-year period, Northeastern University could best serve the needs of the criminal justice system by bringing together members from the various science departments at the University to work in concert with the College of Criminal Justice in the development of forensic science programs. Toward this end, the Institute of Chemical Analysis, Applications, and Forensic Science was established on July 1, 1973, with Professor Barry L. Karger, Department of Chemistry, as Director. Seven faculty from four colleges at the University were appointed as Fellows of the Institute. The overall

goal of the Institute was to develop graduate level research programs in forensic science and to formulate curricula for M.S. and Ph.D. programs in this field. As indicated by its title, the Institute is based on professional expertise in several areas, especially chemical analysis in the widest sense, materials science, and forensics.

The Institute, initially funded by the Educational Development Grant and provided new facilities by the University, set the following prime goals:

To carry on concerted research efforts based on the application of new or existing knowledge to current problems;

To continue the University's and the College of Criminal Justice's tradition of interdisciplinary, society-related educational programs;

To strengthen the ties between University, College, and Community;

To act as a conduit for on-the-job student experiences.

The Institute established two principal divisions, each based on currently existing areas of research strength: the Organic/Biochemical Analysis Division, supported by faculty and staff from the Departments of Chemistry, Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacy, and the College of Criminal Justice; and the Materials Science/Inorganic Analysis Division, which involves faculty and staff from the Departments of Chemistry, Mechanical

Engineering, and Electrical Engineering. The departmental affiliations show that there is a strong interdisciplinary component in the structure of the Institute. This has a two-fold advantage. It provides for ready access to specialized expertise existing in the faculties of many departments and, in addition, makes the Institute available for interdisciplinary, advanced programs to graduate students.

Once the Institute had been established, a great deal of effort began in (1) identifying leading U. S. forensic science laboratories and their personnel; (2) assembling major capital equipment from the LEAA grant and from existing equipment already on campus; (3) recruiting technically competent personnel; (4) developing curricula for the graduate level programs; (5) establishing contacts with federal, state, and local forensic laboratories; and (6) beginning research programs in forensic science.

IDENTIFICATION OF LEADING FORENSIC LABORATORIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Through discussions with Dr. Joseph Peterson of the National Institute and Dr. Ralph Turner of Michigan State University, it was decided to send Faculty Fellows around the country to visit some of the leading forensic laboratories and academic departments. Each Fellow was instructed to ascertain the types of instrumentation currently in use in the particular laboratory, the academic level of the personnel in the laboratory, the types of research programs that the Institute might undertake, and--at universities which had established forensic

science programs--the curriculum and entrance requirements of those programs. These visits, made possible by the grant, were of significant help in the development of the Institute and the forensic science program as a whole.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

A great deal of effort went into the selection of major instrumentation for the research and teaching programs within the Institute. Equipment purchased included: a scanning electron microscope with microprobe detector, solid state counter system for an X-ray diffractometer, modern liquid chromatograph, gas chromatograph for interfacing to a mass spectrometer, and a computer system for a mass spectrometer. Special note should be taken of the excellent facilities in chromatography, mass spectrometry, and materials science. Each of these areas has played an important role in the research and teaching programs of the Institute.

RECRUITMENT

The College performed nationwide searches for major appointments to the Institute. Dr. Paul Vouros, Baylor School of Medicine, was hired as a Senior Scientist to work in the Organic/Biochemical Analysis Division. He is a well-known authority on gas chromatography-mass spectrometry. Dr. Donald Polk, Allied Chemical Corporation, was also hired as a Senior Scientist to work in the Materials Science/Inorganic Analysis Division.

At the professional level, Dr. James Barnard was hired as a postdoctoral fellow. Dr. Barnard came to the Institute from Dr. Bray Culliford's group at Scotland Yard in England. Dr. Barnard, who returned to England in the fall of 1975, was most useful in the development of the biological aspects of the forensic science program. In addition to Dr. Barnard, from time to time the Institute has employed postdoctoral fellows to work in the Organic/Biochemical Analysis Division as well as the Materials Science/Inorganic Analysis Division.

CURRICULUM

The College of Criminal Justice at the time of the grant award was just introducing a graduate program on the master's level with two concentrations of study: administration, police development, and planning; and behavioral science theory and research. Because Northeastern University has particular strength and impressive resources in the area of the "hard" sciences and because the College of Criminal Justice is committed to an interdisciplinary approach to higher education, the decision was made to develop graduate programs in the area of forensics.

The faculty and administration of all colleges and departments involved decided that it would be more beneficial to develop a new master's program in forensics as a feeder program to the doctoral program rather than depend on the traditional science programs in existence. The University decided to title the new programs to be developed, Forensic Chemistry, as

opposed to the more general title, Forensic Science. The master's and doctoral programs consist of basic courses found in the traditional graduate programs of chemistry with the addition of such courses as Forensic Chemistry Techniques, Forensic Materials, Arson and Explosives, and Crime Scene Investigation. Of special interest is the inclusion of courses from the social science area of criminal justice, such as the Administration of Criminal Justice and the Legal Aspects of Forensic Science, as well as such criminal justice electives as Criminology and the Nature and Extent of Crime. In addition, each student in the master's program must spend a minimum of one academic quarter as an in-service trainee at a federal, state, or local forensic laboratory. This internship component has been extended to the doctoral level as an option for those who wish to take advantage of the opportunity.

The Forensic Chemistry graduate programs which are ongoing at this time are a result of extended discussions within the University and consultations with field agencies in which the need for a regional/national, interdisciplinary graduate level program in the science area of criminal justice was ascertained. The program is based primarily upon expertise of existing faculty and staff assembled under the grant from the College of Criminal Justice; the College of Liberal Arts, Department of Chemistry; and the College of Pharmacy, Department of Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacology. Major responsibility for program administration lies with the College of Criminal

Justice. However, interdisciplinary committees for academic administration consist of faculty members from all three colleges.

CONTACTS WITH FORENSIC LABORATORIES

An integral part of the forensic science program at Northeastern is the "hands-on experience" our students receive in the field. In order for this to occur, it was necessary to acquire good working relationships with federal, state, and local forensic laboratories. Such relationships were established with the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Laboratories, Washington, D. C.; the Drug Enforcement Administration Laboratory, McLean, Virginia; the Las Vegas, Nevada, Metropolitan Police Department; the Massachusetts State Police Laboratory, Boston, Massachusetts; and the Boston Police Laboratory, Boston, Massachusetts.

The University has been able to develop relationships with all of these forensic labs which have extended beyond the placing of graduate students with them for internships. In many instances the Institute of Chemical Analysis, Applications, and Forensic Science has been called upon to use its expertise in helping to solve a complex problem facing the laboratory staff.

RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Institute has established a wide range of research programs. The selection of research programs was and is based on the needs within the forensic science field and the capabilities of the Institute.

The main emphasis in the Organic/Biochemical Analysis Division has been the analysis of drugs and drug metabolites in tissues and body fluids. This work involves new methods of chromatographic separation and chemical ionization mass spectrometry. In addition, work has been done on the determination of postmortem level of drugs since some literature reports suggest that, in some cases, elevated levels of drugs are found after death, even though drug overdose was not the cause of death.

In the Materials Science/Inorganic Analysis Division, work has been done in the restoration of erased serial numbers using materials science approaches. This project has led to preventive (unerasable) tagging methods. Other work has been done in the identification of forensically important materials (e.g., metals) from X-ray diffraction patterns using computer search techniques. In addition, evaluation of current methods of fingerprint detection and identification has been researched. Among the newer instrumentation methods being considered are highly specific laser fluorescence techniques.

CONCLUSIONS

What are some of the significant lessons that can be gleaned from the Northeastern University experience?

(1) An effective interdisciplinary program can be developed in criminal justice higher education that combines the faculty and research resources of an institution in a specific way which focuses on particular areas of concentration. The

benefit of such an approach is that it encourages a strong university commitment because of its broad base of involvement. In addition, by involving the best faculty from a large number of academic disciplines, the viability and continued existence of such a program is assured. Thus, once the Educational Development Grant ended, Northeastern University assumed complete support for the Forensic Chemistry Program because of its viable academic and research components.

(2) There are certain significant advantages in having a University administrator as Director of a Project. Dean Rosenblatt of the College of Criminal Justice was the Project Director at Northeastern University and thus the planning, organizing, and introducing of the Forensic Chemistry Program by the appropriate faculties were made easier simply because an administrator could carry them through the administrative steps necessary at a large university. It was no small task to conceive of a complex program such as Forensic Chemistry and then to have it in place, so that the faculty, administration, and trustees could introduce it within a period of three years. The serious problem, however, that a College Dean faces as Project Director is that the myriad reports, papers, and details that are a part of a major grant are not always easily produced. Appropriate and selective delegation of responsibilities and tasks must always be a part of the Project Director's goal, especially if he or she is an academic dean of a major university unit.

(3) In a period of fiscal restraint, such as most universities are presently facing, it is necessary to include many tenured faculty in the creation of new programs. At Northeastern University, the graduate programs in Criminal Justice and Forensic Chemistry were staffed and directed primarily by tenured faculty of significant academic reputation. Thus, the concern about nontenured faculty in newly created programs was not encountered to any great extent at the University. In addition, where new faculty were recruited, the specific responsibilities and academic requirements for the tenure track were outlined so that all faculty could look forward to a rewarding experience at the institution.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PROGRAM HISTORY

By

Don C. Gibbons
Gerald F. Blake

I. INTRODUCTION

A. PREAMBLE

This project history report will begin with a brief discussion of the writing of history, observing that historical accounts are tinged with the biases, predispositions, etc., of the historians who write these accounts. Accordingly, an historical narrative by Commager is likely to differ somewhat from an account, dealing with ostensibly the same events, prepared by Catton, Schlesinger, William Applman Williams, or some other historian. There is rarely a "pure" historical report, unaffected by the particular perspectives of the historian who assembles the details of the past.

In much the same way, one could speak of "The Rashomon Phenomenon," in which factually identical events are perceived in somewhat different ways by different observers. Or, another case-in-point would be the variety of historical reports that were produced about the tumultuous events of the period 1967-1969 at San Francisco State College. Although it might be argued that there is only a single reality to what transpired there, the historical documents that were produced by various analysts of those events are not in agreement. Hence there are multiple and conflicting interpretations of "what happened" in that educational experience.

So, too, is it with the history of the National Criminal Justice Educational Development Project at Portland State University. The account presented in this report constitutes the historical events as perceived by only a few of those who participated in those events, for the authors of this document were limited in the number of interviews they could conduct and in the other historical detective work that they could carry out. If more actors in the project development drama had been interviewed, it is likely that a variety of interpretations of the historical occurrences would have been turned up. This report, then, is one account of the developmental history of the Portland State University project as interpreted by some of the key actors in that three-year experience.

B. PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY--THE SETTING

There are several important features characteristic of Portland State University that are most critical in gaining an understanding of the ways in which the criminal justice project developed at this institution. First, it should be noted that Portland State University is a very young institution. Unlike many tradition-encrusted institutions covered with layers of distinguished academic experience and boasting a hundred-year history, Portland State University is a very young and inexperienced university. This institution had very humble origins as Vanport Extension Center which was created as an extension unit of the Oregon State System of Higher Education in 1947. At the time that it was created, higher education in Oregon was dominated by the University of Oregon at Eugene and, to a lesser extent, by Oregon State College (now University) at Corvallis. The state system also included several teachers colleges located in relatively remote parts of the state and a number of private colleges, the most distinguished of which is Reed College in Portland. But Portland was without any state-supported educational institution at the time that the Vanport Center was created, even though Portland is the only metropolitan community of any consequence in the entire state. No wonder, then, that rosy predictions were offered for this new venture into higher education when it was created. Indeed, as the Vanport Center evolved into

Portland State College and, in 1969, into Portland State University, optimistic predictions abounded to the effect that it would be only a matter of time before the institution would become the dominant center of higher education in the entire state. Although those sanguine forecasts have to some extent been borne out, it is at the same time true that Portland State University has a considerable distance to go before it succeeds in becoming the educational giant in Oregon. The institution continues to receive less budgetary support than the other two state universities, and it continues to lag behind the University of Oregon and Oregon State University in certain other ways as well.

Portland State University was first housed at Vanport, a public housing project area for shipyard workers during World War II. Later, it was moved to a former Portland city high school building which still remains as Lincoln Hall. The area surrounding this initially tiny "campus" was an urban redevelopment area, much of which has been converted into campus and buildings for the University over the years. Currently the University consists of about six main buildings, another half-dozen additional structures, and assorted auxiliary facilities bordering the central business district of Portland. Only a ten-minute walk from the center of the business district, Portland State University is truly an urban institution. It is this feature of the University which often impresses those who offer optimistic

predictions about the future growth and progress of the institution. Indeed, one could borrow from the theme of the week of activities celebrating the inauguration of the new University President (since May 1974), Dr. Joseph Blumel, noting that Portland and the University are "vital partners." If that partnership has not been completely cemented at present, it most surely should be in the future, given the central location of the University in the metropolitan community.

Over the past twenty-five years Portland State University has grown from a handful of students to a current full-time equivalent student population of about 9,500. The University is now third in size in the state, ranking behind the University of Oregon and Oregon State University. Portland State University offers bachelor's and master's degrees in nearly all of the established fields and areas of specialization. It also offers a small number of certificate programs, such as in Urban Studies, as well as certain pre-professional programs. Additionally, Portland State University has been authorized by the State Board of Higher Education to offer Ph.D. degrees in three multi-disciplinary fields: Urban Studies, Environmental Science, and Systems Science.

One exceedingly important point to be emphasized concerns the state board-mandated stricture upon doctoral programs at Portland State University. At least for

some time, doctoral programs in the conventional disciplines or in other, newer fields of study cannot be offered at this University. As a result, it would be quite pointless to enter into protracted debates about whether criminal justice graduate work ought to be connected with established departments, or whether, instead, it ought to be housed in an autonomous program. If there is to be a criminal justice doctoral area of specialization, it must be located in one of the existing three interdisciplinary doctoral programs. Happily, there is a kind of natural affinity between criminal justice and the existing Urban Studies doctoral program, as will be evident in materials presented later in this report.

Portland State University entered into police science and correctional educational programs some years ago with a certificate program in law enforcement and corrections. That is, students who majored in sociology, psychology, or political science were able to take additional courses in law enforcement and corrections in order to earn a certificate, additional to the bachelor's degree. Initially, the undergraduate criminal justice program was staffed largely with part-time faculty drawn from the community. However, a full-time faculty director of the program was ultimately employed. That person was Dr. Lee P. Brown, now sheriff of Multnomah County, Oregon. Still later, another full-time faculty person was added to the criminal justice program. In addition, the program achieved departmental status

under the developmental guidance of Dr. Brown. At present, students who major in Administration of Justice (the current title of that department) are required to complete a series of courses drawn from such fields of study as sociology, psychology, and the like. In addition, they must complete a number of required or "core" courses in Administration of Justice and a series of courses in the Law Enforcement or Corrections options of Administration of Justice.

The growth of student population in the undergraduate Administration of Justice degree program has paralleled trends that have taken place nationwide. Thus the number of student majors in this program in 1971 was 75, in 1972 it was 125, and in 1974-75 the number of majors had burgeoned to 410. At present, this department is one of the largest in terms of student numbers in the entire College of Social Science.

C. THE NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT--SOME BACKGROUND EVENTS

The current LEAA-funded Consortium project did not just spring up spontaneously at Portland State University. Instead, this project had been preceded by some exploration on the part of LEAA officials and certain University faculty members of the possible establishment of a "Center of Excellence" on this campus. These local discussions did not eventuate in any program being established, since that project was stillborn.

The "Centers of Excellence" explorations at this University were not followed up by any sustained, careful examination by University persons of the prospects for some kind of criminal justice doctoral education program here. Consequently the LEAA Consortium opportunity came upon the institution without much warning and without much pre-planning. It surely should be acknowledged that the three-year grant represented a remarkable opportunity for program innovation for a very sizable sum of money was provided in the grant, making acceptance of the offer of LEAA support almost irresistible. The offer of grant support was particularly appealing to the University then, since Portland State University was in a period of severe budgetary crunch due to lower-than-predicted student enrollments.

The LEAA funding represented a remarkable opportunity in another way as well. When the University accepted the funding and signed the Consortium agreement, it was then committed to moving with dispatch toward creation of a doctoral program in criminal justice. Under the terms of the Consortium agreement, some tangible product had to be forthcoming; thus the University faculty was not allowed the usual luxury of endless debates about new program proposals and other educational innovations. The often-encountered academic phenomena of dilatory action, interminable debates, studying to death of proposals, and the like had to be avoided so that the University could deliver

the product that it had agreed upon with LEAA. In short, the Portland State University experience tends to confirm the adage that "Money talks," for this National Criminal Justice Educational Development Project funding most assuredly led to much faster results than if no federal funding had been available. Indeed, in all likelihood, no criminal justice doctoral program would have developed at this University without LEAA funding.

The other side of the coin is that the lack of planning prior to, and immediately after, acquisition of the LEAA windfall had much to do with the somewhat faltering steps taken by the project during its first year of existence at the University. Universities represent exceedingly complex social organizations, and the introduction of new programs and elements into those systems is not easily achieved without false starts, unless the alterations in the organization are based on much careful planning and institutional deliberation.

However, one should not make too much of the developmental difficulties of the Portland State University project during its first year of existence. These problems were not major ones, nor were they permanent difficulties. Also, whatever the minor difficulties of the first year, they were more than amply compensated for by the basic fact that the three-year LEAA grant did culminate in the establishment of a viable, quality Ph.D. program in criminal

justice that became operative in 1975-76, from a 1973 base in which no program whatever existed.

The criminal justice developmental endeavor was a three-year project. As they unfolded, the project events fell into three fairly distinct stages or periods, coinciding almost exactly with the three calendar years of the project. In the narrative to follow, these three stages are identified as "Year One--Start Up," "Year Two--Program Development," and "Year Three--In Business." These three periods cover the academic years 1973-74, 1974-75, and 1975-76.

II. YEAR ONE--START UP

A: INTRODUCTION

The first year of the LEAA project was one in which a good deal of strain, turmoil, and institutional uncertainty existed in the background. For one thing, President Gregory B. Wolfe who had signed the Consortium agreement was widely rumored to be "in trouble" with the State Board of Higher Education. President Wolfe announced his resignation early in 1973, indicating his intention to step down from his position at the close of the academic year. A national search was undertaken to find a successor to President Wolfe. Wolfe subsequently speeded up his resignation in order to run for elective office. His position was filled on an acting basis by E. Dean Anderson for a substantial portion of the year, with much of the basic presidential decision-making being done by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Joseph Blumel. Dr. Blumel was eventually named President of the University, taking the reins of University management in May 1974. At the same time, Dr. Richard Halley was named Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs, a post which he held during academic year 1974-75. The point of these comments is that there was a good deal of uncertainty and ambiguity about University governance during the first year of the project. Additionally, as already noted, the LEAA grant appeared without much warning or opportunity for extended advance planning.

Some mention should be made at this point of the faculty rumblings that accompanied the award of LEAA funding to the University. It is probably fair to say that most of the faculty were relatively disinterested in the LEAA grant, for faculty members tend to be characteristically detached about events that do not impinge directly upon them or their work styles. However, a small group of relatively vociferous critics of the grant and of LEAA did surface and did offer up various allegations that LEAA was an agency involved in "oppression," "repression," and kindred crimes. These objections and claims were voiced at a Faculty Senate meeting concerned with the criminal justice grant. At that meeting, Vice President Blumel did assure the Faculty Senate that it would have the final say about whether or not a criminal justice program would be inaugurated here, when a proposed program was ultimately drafted. This assurance from Vice President Blumel had the effect of dissipating the force of protests against University acceptance of the funds. After this Senate meeting, faculty opposition to the criminal justice grant became relatively muted.

The academic year of 1973-74 was a difficult one for the University. Student enrollment had declined and the University was faced with a massive deficit. Contingency plans to terminate large numbers of faculty, both tenured and untenured, due to a state of "financial exigency" were being widely discussed. Hardly a day went by that some

department head was not faced with a demand from a dean or other higher administrator that lists of "endangered" faculty be prepared. The mood of the University was decidedly bleak during this academic year.

One of the consequences of the dire financial straits in which the University found itself during the first year was that a great many persons wanted "a piece of the action" as far as the LEAA funding was concerned. A number of deans and other officials coveted the funds, seeing them as possibly providing the means by which some faculty member or another might be saved from the financial ax. For example, there was University reluctance to fill the position of Research Director of the project with a person hired from outside the University, in light of the possibility that some persons now on the faculty might have to be terminated. As a result, the Research Director position was filled by two persons on a part-time basis during 1973-74.

During the early months of the project, various administrative leaders at the University gave conflicting advice, statements, directives, etc., regarding the issue of where the criminal justice doctoral program was to be located within the University. The logical program in which to place criminal justice would seem to have been the Urban Studies doctoral program, but there was a good deal of vacillation about this matter in the first few months. Doubtless this lack of clear guidance from the administration to the program and its first Director was a function of the two aspects of the

University cited above: the administrative uncertainty revolving around "the changing of the guard" in the President's office and an interest on the part of some administrators in employing LEAA funds to mitigate the severity of the financial crunch.

Still another development during the first year of the project centered about expectations that grew up on the part of some persons in the Region X LEAA office, in the local High Impact Crime Reduction project staff office, and on the part of Portland Chief of Police Bruce Baker, concerning the directions to be taken by the criminal justice project. Although the specific expectations of these persons and agencies were not in agreement, all of them anticipated that the criminal justice doctoral program would develop in ways different than it has, in fact, developed. For example, Chief Baker apparently anticipated that a more narrowly focused program of training in police administration would be constructed, while some criminal justice agency persons expected the program to have a larger applied thrust than they currently perceive in it. Some of these expectations were discordant with the program directions possible within the Urban Studies framework, as well as being somewhat different from the perspectives of the faculty members who drafted the criminal justice curriculum. A good deal of attention was given over in the second year of the project to attempts to reconcile the expectations of some of these "consumers" of the educational product with

the program framework that emerged during the developmental year. However, some of this dialogue might have been unnecessary had the issue of where the criminal justice program was to be located been settled at the outset.

D. YEAR ONE ACTIVITIES

During the first year of the Portland State University project, Charles Tracy served as Project Director. Mr. Tracy served in a dual capacity during this year for he was also in charge of the Administration of Justice undergraduate program.

One of the early events in this first year was the creation of a PERT structuring of project activities. The revised PERT timetable for the project is indicated on the following pages. Two comments are in order about this PERT scheduling. First, over the lifetime of the Consortium project, this PERT scheme has quietly been dropped; hence the seven Consortium institutions were eventually released from the obligation to follow the PERT schedule. In the Portland State case, we have endeavored to carry out most of the steps and activities identified in the PERT schedule, although with some modifications in timing, etc. Second, the experience with the PERT timetable points up some of the complexities of universities and some of the bureaucratic mazes that must be confronted in creating new programs. The PERT timetable implies that university decision-making lends itself to rigid timetables, bureaucratic orderliness, and other features. But, in fact, the project has not managed to unfold

in quite the manner suggested in this timetable of events. To take one example, a great deal of prodding was required in the second year of the project to get various faculty groups to accomplish their part of the curriculum-development activities in order to come at least close to complying with the schedule outlined in the PERT timetable.

National Criminal Justice Educational Development

Consortium Project

Portland State University

May 1974

Dates	PERT Event Descriptions
10-73	1. Start project
10-73	2. Start administrative activities
10-73	3. Start technology transfer activities
11-73	4. Complete Portland State University review of project
12-73	5. Start research activities
1-74	6. Start doctoral curriculum development research studies
1-74	7. Start manpower/educational research studies
1-74	8. Start project/Consortium evaluation studies
4-74	9. Start LEEP study
6-74	10. Complete PSU criminal justice instructional/research resource study
6-74	11. Complete LEEP study
7-74	12. Start criminal justice doctoral educational requirements study
7-74	13. Start criminal justice doctoral instructional models study
7-74	14. Start criminal justice knowledge transfer study
7-74	15. Start criminal justice manpower needs study
7-74	16. Start criminal justice placement study
7-74	17. Start Region X criminal justice education/training coordination study
7-74	18. Start implementing project evaluation procedures

<u>Dates</u>	<u>PERT Event Descriptions (cont.)</u>
7-74	19. Start implementing Consortium evaluation procedures
8-74	20. Complete criminal justice research models study
8-74	21. Complete criminal justice educational standards and goals study
8-74	22. Complete criminal justice doctoral educational requirements study
8-74	23. Complete criminal justice doctoral instructional models study
9-74	24. Complete formulation of criminal justice doctoral curriculum models
9-74	25. Start review of research reports and preparation of new course proposals by criminal justice doctoral curriculum subcommittee of Urban Studies curriculum committee
1-75	26. Start review of criminal justice doctoral curriculum by Urban Studies curriculum committee
1-75	27. Start implementing criminal justice knowledge transfer procedures
1-75	28. Start coordinating criminal justice knowledge transfer procedures with other project technology transfer activities
2-75	29. Start search for prospective criminal justice doctoral students
2-75	30. Start review of criminal justice doctoral curriculum by Urban Studies faculty
3-75	31. Start review of criminal justice doctoral curriculum by Dean of Graduate Studies
4-75	32. Start review of criminal justice doctoral curriculum by Office of Academic Affairs
4-75	33. Complete selection of criminal justice doctoral students for 1975-76 academic year
5-75	34. Start review of criminal justice doctoral curriculum by Graduate Council

<u>Dates</u>	<u>PERT Event Descriptions (cont.)</u>
6-75	35. Start review of criminal justice doctoral curriculum by Faculty Senate
6-75	36. Start search for criminal justice doctoral faculty
7-75	37. Start review of criminal justice doctoral curriculum by Vice President and President
8-75	38. Start review of criminal justice doctoral curriculum by Chancellor's office
8-75	39. Complete hiring of criminal justice doctoral faculty
9-75	40. Start offering criminal justice doctoral courses (fall 1975)
11-75	41. Start advertising criminal justice doctoral program
1-76	42. Start winter 1976 criminal justice doctoral courses
3-76	43. Complete selection of criminal justice doctoral students for 1976-77 academic year
3-76	44. Start spring 1976 criminal justice doctoral courses
6-76	45. Complete manpower/educational research studies
6-76	46. Start summer 1976 criminal justice doctoral courses
8-76	47. Complete preparation final project reports

A fairly sizable number of persons were involved in one capacity or another in the criminal justice project during its first year. Two faculty members shared the Research Director position and directed the work of research associates. The research workers conducted the following studies:

1. The LEEP study
2. A survey of institutional instructional-research resources. A majority of the faculty was surveyed in order to determine the number of persons currently at the University with instructional or research interests or capabilities in criminal justice.
3. A criminal justice educational and research models study. This study culminated in a lengthy project document that discussed the varied perspectives on crime and criminal justice currently in existence in the United States. This study then proceeded to explicate the curriculum implications of these perspectives and viewpoints on criminal justice and upon criminal justice research.
4. An initial inquiry into field placement opportunities for criminal justice doctoral candidates.
5. A regional educational programs survey. This survey was initiated by Charles Tracy just prior to his resignation as Project Director. Mr. Tracy

appointed Lawrence Salmony to conduct a two-year study of regional education and to explore the feasibility of criminal justice consortia. However, Salmony's work did not begin until after Dr. Gibbons was appointed Project Director.

During the first year of the project, a number of graduate students and faculty members were provided with project funding in order to conduct criminal justice-related research studies. Reports of these studies have accumulated as part of a series of "Project Reports" from the Portland State University project.

As already noted, a good deal of confusion existed during the first year of the project regarding the question of whether the criminal justice doctorate was to be a part of the Urban Studies program or whether it was to be structured in some other way. During this period, the Project Director and the head of the Urban Studies Ph.D. program were caught up in recurring disagreements which led, ultimately, to a decision on the part of the Urban Studies faculty to disassociate itself from the criminal justice project. At that point, late in 1973-74, the academic status of the criminal justice project was in limbo. This uncertainty about where the program was to be located, its links, if any, to existing doctoral programs, etc., represented a problem that cried out for resolution. It was on this note of uncertainty that the academic year drew to a close.

III. YEAR TWO--PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

A. PROJECT REORGANIZATION

The second year of the criminal justice project began with the resignation of Charles Tracy as Director. His resignation was due largely to the pressing demands of the undergraduate program over which he has administrative control. Tracy resigned early in the summer of 1974. At that point, Dr. Don Gibbons volunteered to assume the directorship of the project. He was appointed as Director on July 22, 1974, with Charles Tracy remaining on as Associate Director until September. Gibbons began directing the project in July but did not appear on the project payroll until September 1, 1974.

A second reorganization step that occurred at the beginning of the academic year was the hiring of Dr. Gerald Blake from the University of Oregon as Research Director of the project. In addition, a full-time project secretary was employed for the first time. Finally, the project was moved during the summer from quarters in a building near the library to "temporary" quarters in Francis Manor. Unfortunately, the temporary housing of the project extended well into spring 1975, exacerbating many of the problems of project organization and direction. The offices and work rooms provided to the project were insufficient to meet the needs of the project staff as it expanded during the academic year. The extended stay in temporary quarters was

occasioned by the fact that extensive remodeling of other quarters in another building was delayed, postponing the move of another department out of the rooms to be occupied by the criminal justice project.

The most important initial step taken by the new Director, Gibbons, was his explication of the directions to be pursued by the project during its second year. Gibbons drafted a lengthy letter to the project manager, Carl Hamm, outlining the nature of the criminal justice doctoral program that he would endeavor to create and inquiring about the compatibility of these directions with the expectations of LEAA. Gibbons' letter also indicated that the criminal justice program would have to become a part of the ongoing Urban Studies Ph.D. program if it were to become viable.

Carl Hamm's response to Gibbons' query was that the directions outlined in the letter were quite consistent with the expectations and aspirations of LEAA. The President and Acting Vice President of the University also indicated their support of those plans. As a consequence, Gibbons moved immediately to get the criminal justice program reinstated within Urban Studies. The formal reinstatement occurred at the first meeting of the Urban Studies faculty in October 1974, where Gibbons presented a summary of program plans and directions to the faculty. The Urban Studies faculty voted to accept the criminal justice project back into that program, and additionally, Gibbons was offered an appointment as Professor of Urban Studies (and Sociology).

The first several months of the second project year were exceedingly busy ones. For example, the project began the academic year with approximately \$48,000 of unexpended Graduate Research Fellowship funds to be awarded. Gibbons and Blake had to move with dispatch to draft guidelines for fellowship awards, advertise the availability of these fellowship funds, and award research fellowships to qualified applicants. During October 1974, eight fellowships were awarded, with one going to an Urban Studies (criminal justice) Ph.D. student, a second one to another Urban Studies doctoral candidate, three to M.S.W. candidates, two to Sociology M.S. candidates, and one to a Political Science graduate student.

B. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

A number of project studies directly related to the building of a criminal justice doctoral education capability were inaugurated or continued during this second year. For one, the project embarked upon a detailed manpower needs study in Region X, including the preparation of manpower projections, which utilized several different procedures for generating manpower forecasts and projections. A second set of projects centered about the preparation of a very extensive criminal justice bibliography and a briefer, annotated bibliography dealing with youth diversion programs. The larger bibliography represented a joint project undertaken with Arizona State University.

A third project study dealt with regional educational programs. That project was initially to be directed by Mr. Lawrence Salmony; however, he resigned from the project in December 1974. His responsibilities were then assumed by two research associates in the project. The regional educational study consists of a survey of criminal justice programs in community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities in the region. Additionally, the educational study contains an extended discussion of alternative perspectives on criminal justice educational needs, as well as detailed commentary on new models for manpower and educational training in criminal justice, particularly as they have to do with innovative and preventive attacks on the crime and delinquency problem.

Another small-scale program development project undertaken during the year centered about an examination of economic analyses of criminality. This project was conducted by a project research assistant. The intent of the project was to survey the emerging economic literature on costs of crime, deterrence, varied economic perspectives on crime, and kindred topics. The central purpose of this project was to collate the existing literature on economic analyses of crime toward the objective of future course development in the Department of Economics. The research assistant conducting this project worked with a member of that department in prosecuting this study to conclusion.

C. RESEARCH CAPABILITY STUDIES AND PROJECTS

One of the basic facts of life at Portland State University is that relatively little criminal justice-related basic research has been conducted here over past years. The roster of persons with special competence in criminal justice areas of interest would include Gibbons, Blake, Charles Tracy, Dr. Gary Perlstein in the Administration of Justice undergraduate department, and a small group of additional faculty members. This "core" faculty group has conducted some criminal justice research in past years. For example, Gibbons and certain other Sociology faculty members have carried out two social surveys dealing with citizens' perceptions of crime, deviant behavior, and related matters. Additionally, Gibbons conducted a "feasibility study," dealing with jail practices and misdemeanor criminal justice experiences for the state Corrections Division. A number of other separate projects of this kind have been completed over the years. Nonetheless, it is the case that a vigorous tradition of criminal justice research has not existed at this University to this point. Accordingly, one major task of the criminal justice project during the second year revolved around sponsorship of a number of pieces of basic research on crime, criminal justice, and related topics.

The research endeavors undertaken during the year were designed to accomplish another goal as well, namely the creation and nourishment of meaningful ties between the criminal justice program at the University and criminal

justice agencies in the community. Thus one study consisted of a comprehensive review of the criminological literature dealing with female delinquency and criminality, as well as some original research conducted in Oregon regarding the state training school for delinquent females. Another research project dealt with certain aspects of the development of deviant careers among drug dealers. A third inquiry had to do with a follow-up investigation of the subsequent work activities of persons who had been involved in the Corrections Teacher Corps experience in Oregon.

The criminal justice project also funded some innovative and exploratory work by a faculty member in the Department of Physical Education, having to do with the use of health and physical education experiences in keeping troublesome and delinquent youths in school and dealing with some of their social liabilities that contribute to their deviant and lawbreaking endeavors in the community. Still another faculty research project dealt with an examination of evidence on terrorist activities, political activities, bombings, and kindred forms of "new crime" in the United States. That project is part of a continuing line of basic research being carried on by Gibbons and R. Kelly Hancock of the Department of Sociology.

During 1974-1975, the project also sponsored a comprehensive research study carried out in Clackamas County, Oregon Juvenile Court, dealing with the social and psychological consequences of divorce experiences upon minor

children. The central hypothesis under examination in this research is that certain parent-child patterns of adjustment to divorce contribute inordinately to behavior problems on the part of youngsters, including delinquent involvement. The principal investigator in this project is a faculty member in the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Oregon Medical School. The intent of this project was three-fold: to contribute to knowledge, to develop research ties with the juvenile court, and to develop faculty linkages between this University and the University of Oregon.

A final piece of basic research initiated during this year consisted of a study of policing activities in the North Precinct of Portland. That study collected detailed data regarding the "peace keeping" and "order maintenance" activities of the police, as well as information on the crime control activities of the precinct officers. The study, which will probably continue into 1975-1976, also involves a survey of police and citizen attitudes about police activities, as well as application of an organizational analysis "model" to police work. This project has the support of the Portland Police Department.

D. EXPERIMENTAL COURSES

The criminal justice doctoral curriculum was under development during this year, hence there were no established graduate level courses to be offered during 1974-1975. However, the project did sponsor a number of "experimental"

versions of courses that were likely to become part of the curriculum under development.

One of these experimental ventures was a graduate level course on program evaluation, conducted by two members of the Institute on Aging at the University. Blake and Gibbons also participated in this course, giving one lengthy presentation on program evaluation problems and tactics in criminal justice.

A second experimental course, sponsored and funded by the project, involved Dr. Kenneth Polk of the University of Oregon. His two-quarter juvenile delinquency research seminar included a number of project-funded research assistants in it. The seminar dealt with research techniques in delinquency studies, but it also involved extensive participation by the students in research activities in which delinquency data drawn from Polk's Marion County Youth Study were utilized in research projects conducted by the trainees. A series of project reports is to eventuate from this research seminar project.

Both Gibbons and Blake taught criminology or delinquency courses in the undergraduate sociology program during this year. In addition, Blake offered an experimental course on problems of alienated youth during one academic term, while Gibbons offered an Urban Studies-Sociology seminar on the Causes and Control of Crime in Urban Areas during spring quarter. The latter is an experimental version of a "core" seminar to be offered in the criminal justice curriculum

during 1975-1976. Finally, Blake conducted a "Seminar in Criminal Justice" during the entire academic year, in which research assistants and graduate research fellows in the project were required to enroll and in which they participated through presentation of papers and other activities.

E. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

The project PERT timetable presented earlier indicates that the criminal justice doctoral curriculum was to be developed during this academic year for implementation in 1975-1976. Accordingly, curriculum development activities had to be begun immediately at the beginning of the academic year and had to be moved along briskly so that a proposed curriculum could make its way through the various approval stages. In order for a criminal justice curriculum to become operational, approval of that curriculum was required by the Urban Studies curriculum committee, the Urban Studies faculty, the University Graduate Council, the Academic Senate, the President and Academic Vice President, and, finally, the State Board of Higher Education.

An ad hoc curriculum subcommittee was appointed by Dr. Mohad Toulon, head of the Urban Studies Ph.D. program, in early October 1974. That subcommittee was chaired by Gibbons. The other members of the subcommittee were drawn from the undergraduate criminal justice faculty, from other Urban Studies areas, and from the Urban Studies graduate student group.

The subcommittee held a series of meetings during October, November, and early December during which they produced a number of component documents which ultimately became parts of the final subcommittee report. In brief, these documents included a statement of the kind of criminal justice doctoral recipient we intend to produce, a detailed listing of the "content domains" or areas of criminal justice knowledge to be mastered by the student, a set of proposed graduate courses and seminars, and a listing of courses in ancillary areas of study that would be useful to criminal justice candidates.

The final subcommittee report speaks principally about doctoral training in criminal justice due to the fact that the LEAA project centers most heavily upon preparation of criminal justice Ph.D.'s. However, the graduate candidate who wishes to pursue a master's degree has several options open to him. First, he could opt for the M.U.S.-Research degree (Master of Urban Studies-Research), specializing in criminal justice by taking a substantial portion of the criminal justice seminars and courses. Another route to a criminal justice M.S. degree would be through Sociology or Political Science, in which the student could similarly enroll in a number of the proposed criminal justice offerings. It is anticipated that these courses and seminars will, in fact, be fairly heavily populated with master's degree candidates next year.

The report of the curriculum subcommittee was transmitted to the Urban Studies standing curriculum committee in January 1975. That committee approved the proposed curriculum, but did request some further explication of the nature of criminal justice as a field, the linkage of criminal justice to Urban Studies, and certain other questions.

The proposed curriculum was presented to the entire Urban Studies faculty on March 7, 1975. That faculty approved of the proposed curriculum, but with a few minor suggestions for changes in the curriculum. The most substantial of these alterations has to do with the proposed US 510 Criminal Justice Planning. That course is to be divided into two related graduate courses, US 510 Criminal Justice Programs and Planning I, and US 510 Criminal Justice Programs and Planning II. The first of these graduate courses will deal with organizational patterns in criminal justice, intervention strategies, and a number of related matters. The second graduate course will retain the content originally identified for the Criminal Justice Planning course.

During the remainder of 1975-1976, the proposed curriculum moved through the University approval channels, and was sent to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education during summer 1975. Because the proposed criminal justice degree curriculum is an additional "field-area concentration" within the existing Urban Studies doctoral program and since the Urban Studies-Criminal Justice Ph.D. candidates will be required to meet all of the basic Urban Studies requirements,

the proposed curriculum does not constitute a "new program" proposal. As a consequence, the submission of the proposed new field-area of concentration to these faculty groups and organizations and to the state board was largely an informational step. In short, the crucial decision about the program was reached on March 7, 1975, when the Urban Studies faculty gave its approval to the criminal justice curriculum. The University Graduate Council approved the proposed curriculum on May 19, while the University Academic Senate approved the program on June 9, 1975.

During the period from December 1974 to March 1975, while the proposed curriculum was undergoing faculty scrutiny, a good deal of effort was expended in soliciting opinions, evaluations, and recommendations regarding the curriculum from criminal justice educators and criminal justice administrators.

On the whole, responses to the curriculum have been positive, if not always enthusiastic. The most obvious exceptions to this statement are found in the cases of Chief of Police Baker and the Impact agency personnel. During the remainder of this year and in the following one, the project staff intends to continue the dialogue with Chief Baker in order to explore possibilities for closer relations between the department and the project. As previously noted, a police research study is being funded by the project.

Gibbons and Blake have also continued to discuss the emerging curriculum with persons from the Impact project, the most recent meeting being in March 1975. Some tentative plans were explored in that meeting having to do with project sponsorship of some small conferences and workshops during spring 1975, in which agency workers and project personnel are to zero in upon the issue of closing the gap between proposed curriculum offerings and the perceived needs of criminal justice practitioners. Then too, some detailed plans have been made to continue the honing and polishing of the curricular offerings, particularly in criminal justice planning and program evaluation research, during 1975-76. The third year of the project will be the initial year in which the criminal justice program is to be offered. We intend to embark upon that year in an exploratory fashion, to some extent. That is, although the major outlines of the criminal justice curriculum are now fairly clearly established, we intend to continue to examine our offerings critically in the light of our experiences with them next year. Then too, we intend to continue disseminating a detailed description of our program to criminal justice educators and criminal justice practitioners, soliciting their responses, advice, and recommendations for possible program additions, modifications, etc.

F. ADMISSION OF DOCTORAL CANDIDATES IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The criminal justice project began the 1974-1975 academic year with one doctoral candidate in Urban Studies-Criminal Justice. Mr. Michael Wiatrowski was admitted to the Urban Studies program in spring 1974 from Florida State University where he received an M.A. degree in criminology. Wiatrowski was awarded a graduate research fellowship for 1974-1975. He has completed a considerable portion of his required Urban Studies work during this year and will complete his criminal justice course work in 1975-1976.

Applications for admission to the Urban Studies Ph.D. and M.U.S. programs for 1975-1976 were due March 1, 1975. The admissions committee of Urban Studies admitted four Ph.D. criminal justice candidates and two alternates. All four of the first selections have indicated their acceptance of admission. In addition, some number of M.U.S.-Research candidates will be admitted and will be enrolled in criminal justice offerings, as will also some continuing and new graduate students from Sociology and certain other departments. Accordingly, it is anticipated that approximately fifteen to twenty active graduate students will participate in the inaugural year of the newly developed criminal justice program.

G. HIRING OF NEW FACULTY

Explorations have been undertaken during 1974-1975 in the direction of hiring some faculty members to staff

criminal justice graduate courses, additional to Gibbons and Blake. No firm hiring commitments were made before March 1, 1975, in advance of Urban Studies approval of the new curriculum. However, a top-level, experienced correctional administrator from the State of Oregon criminal justice system, Mr. Joseph Thimm, has agreed to join the project next year. In addition, Dr. Nanette J. Davis, formerly of Central Michigan University, has accepted a joint appointment in the program and in the Department of Sociology for 1975-1976.

H. PROJECT REPORTS, 1974-75

1. Don Gibbons, "New Directions in Juvenile Justice," Project Report, mimeographed.
2. Don Gibbons, "Offender Typologies--Two Decades Later," British Journal of Criminology, April 1975.
3. David Griswold and Michael DeShane, "Criminal Justice Manpower Projections: Is There an Alternative?" Project Report, mimeographed.
4. Don Gibbons, Barry D. Lebowitz, and Gerald F. Blake, "Observations on Program Evaluation in Corrections," Project Report (Crime and Delinquency, forthcoming).
5. Don Gibbons, "Emerging Perspectives in Criminology and Criminal Justice," Project Report, mimeographed.
6. Florence Yospe, ed., "Diversion from the Juvenile Justice System: An Annotated Bibliography," Project Report, mimeographed.
7. Florence Yospe, ed., "Criminal Justice: A Multi-Disciplinary Bibliography" (published with Arizona State University).
8. Don Gibbons and Gerald Blake, "Concept Paper, LEAA Discretionary Funding Program for Juvenile Diversion," mimeographed.

9. Don C. Gibbons and Gerald F. Blake, "Building a Criminal Justice Ph.D.," Project Paper.
10. Michael DeShane and David Griswold, "Educational Programs, Criminal Justice Manpower Needs, and New Directions in Education: Focus on Region X," Project Report.
11. Kathryn Farr and Cynthia Madaris, "An Institutional experience for Juvenile Offenders," Project Report.
12. Kathryn Farr, "The Study of Female Crime: Approaches and Implication," Project Report.
13. Don C. Gibbons and R. Kelly Hancock, "The Future of Crime in American Society," paper presented at Pacific Sociological Association meetings, April 1975.
14. R. Kelly Hancock and Don C. Gibbons, "Some Criminological Forecasts for a Society That Is Coming Apart," paper presented at American Society of Criminology meetings, November 1974.
15. Robert Broadhead, "Toward a Doctoral Education in Criminal Justice: Research Models and Curriculum Recommendations," Project Report.
16. Priscilla Kimboko, ed., "The Impact of Divorce on Children and Their Parents: A Bibliography," Project Report.
17. Don C. Gibbons and Gerald F. Blake, "Perspectives in Criminology and Criminal Justice: The Implications for Higher Education Programs," paper prepared for the Conference on Key Issues in Criminal Justice Doctoral Education, Omaha, Nebraska, October 1975.

IV. YEAR THREE--IN BUSINESS

The activities to be pursued in the criminal justice program during the third year are already fairly clear so that a reasonably detailed forecast of the directions of the project in the third year can be offered.

First, of course, most of the proposed courses in the criminal justice field-area of specialization are to be offered. The newly admitted M.U.S. and Ph.D. candidates in criminal justice are to become engaged in the program, taking coursework and planning later to engage in thesis research.

A second line of activity in the third year will center about continuation of some of the research projects undertaken in 1974-1975. All of the project development studies will have been completed at the end of the second year except for the evaluation effort. In the case of the evaluation study, much of the data for that effort will have been assembled in the final version of this project history narrative. However, the Clackamas County Juvenile Court project will continue into the third year, as probably also will the inquiry at the Portland Police North Precinct. Additionally, the experimental venture in physical education with predelinquents will continue into 1975-1976. Finally, a relatively small number of new research projects by faculty members will also be initiated.

As indicated earlier, the curriculum of the criminal justice program will continue to be scrutinized and evaluated in the third year of the project. In particular, current plans are to utilize the skills and expertise of the criminal justice administrator to be appointed to the project in a line of activities directed at accumulation of annotated bibliographies and other criminal justice technology materials in the area of criminal justice planning. That is, we plan to give the newly appointed faculty person major responsibility for the development of a series of detailed instructional "models" and other learning materials that can be employed in courses on program evaluation and criminal justice planning. Further, we anticipate disseminating these teaching materials and instructional documents to other institutions in the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium.

Finally, a good deal of discussion has already taken place between Gibbons, Blake, and other project staff having to do with new lines of endeavor to be pursued in the third year, toward expanding the scope of project activities. We intend to begin utilizing the research skills that have accumulated in the project during the first two years, seeking out opportunities to bring those skills and expertise to bear upon research topics, programs to be evaluated, etc. In particular, we would hope to expand some of our activities in the direction of creation of an Institute for Criminal Justice Research or Center for Criminal Justice Studies.

The purpose of a Criminal Justice Center would be to provide an enabling vehicle through which the criminal justice program could begin to generate research proposals addressed to agencies such as the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Independently of whether the Consortium projects are refunded after 1976 by LEAA, we hope to expand the research efforts of the program and to generate sources of funding that will allow us to offer financial support to graduate students as well as research experience within the program.

On this point, mention should be made of the fact that Gibbons and Blake submitted a concept paper to LEAA's Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Operation Task Group in May 1975, dealing with the federal diversion effort to be undertaken by LEAA. We were subsequently informed that we have been chosen to conduct this evaluation planning effort in collaboration with JJDPOTG. Our efforts in this project were inaugurated in June 1975 and will continue to May 31, 1976.

V. SOME FINAL WORDS

The conclusion to the three-year effort in criminal justice at Portland State cannot be drafted in final form at this point, midway through the project experience. However, Gibbons, Blake, and a number of others have high hopes for this endeavor. Portland State University is the only university offering a Ph.D. in criminal justice in the Pacific Northwest. We have developed a program that is designed to produce criminal justice administrators, program evaluators, and planners, as well as criminal justice educators. We have already received a great many inquiries about the doctoral program even though we did not advertise the program widely during the second year. We refrained from detailed efforts to recruit students or to disseminate information about the program, in advance of being certain that a criminal justice curriculum would be produced during 1974-1975. That uncertainty has now been resolved. At midpoint in the project, we look forward with considerable anticipation to an impressive growth year in 1975-1976 and in years beyond.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
PROGRAM HISTORY

By
Peter P. Lejins

FIRST STEPS

First indications that the University of Maryland might be considered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice to be one of the Universities in the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium came in September of 1973. The Director of the Institute was informed by the then Associate Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Mr. Richard W. Velde that the six universities had been selected for participation in the Consortium being created, and that the University of Maryland would be the seventh member. The other six universities were selected somewhat earlier, and their representatives were meeting with the representatives of the LEAA and among themselves. The purpose of the Consortium was indicated as the development or strengthening of doctoral programs in the area of criminal justice, and the size of the grants being given for a period of three years was stated as approximately 600 to 650

thousand dollars. Very soon thereafter a representative of LEAA, Mr. Norval Jespersen, met with the Director of the Institute, and the process of developing the proposal for the grant began. It was concluded when on November 16, 1973, the Consortium Agreement was signed in Washington, D. C., by the presidents of the seven universities or their representatives. As far as the University of Maryland is concerned, the grant itself was dated as of November 1, 1973. At the time of the grant, the status of criminal justice education at the University of Maryland was as follows.

STATUS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
AT THE TIME OF RECEIPT OF CONSORTIUM GRANT

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

The University of Maryland is a large state university which comprises five campuses and is one of the largest state university systems in the nation. The campus involved in the Consortium grant is the College Park Campus, located in Prince George's County near Washington, D. C., at a distance of about 9 miles from the White House and approximately 30 miles from Baltimore. The student population at the College Park Campus at the time of the grant was approximately 35,000. The university's location within the metropolitan areas of Washington, D. C., and Baltimore provides ready access to abundant cultural, governmental, and organizational facilities, both in the nation's capital and the State of Maryland. The University is governed by a Board of Regents appointed by the Governor of the

State and the President of the University, who is the executive officer of the Board of Regents and is supported in his activities by five Vice Presidents and appropriate staff. Each campus of the University has as its chief administrative officer a Chancellor supported by several Vice Chancellors. There is a College Park Campus Senate which comprises elected representatives from the faculty, the students, the administration, and the staff, as well as a number of ex officio members.

At the time of the grant, the University of Maryland, and the College Park Campus specifically, were undergoing a process of extensive organizational change. This process began in 1970, when the above-described structure of a state university with five campuses replaced the previous structure of a university governed by a President and a University Senate and comprising the College Park Campus, the Professional Schools in Baltimore, a campus on the Eastern Shore, a campus in Baltimore County, and the so-called University College which represented the adult education and extension activities of the University. After the establishment of the separate five campuses under a Chancellor for each, the College Park Campus underwent an extensive reorganization, in the course of which the structure of five divisions--i.e., Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, Physical Sciences, Life Sciences, and Human and Community Resources--replaced the previous structure of colleges, among which the College of Arts and Science was the largest.

In the fall of 1973, when the Consortium grant began to be considered, this new organizational plan had been worked out, approved up to the final approval by the Regents, and made operational without the structure being completely finalized. The new plan became fully operational beginning with July 1, 1974.

THE INSTITUTE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND CRIMINOLOGY

The Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology was established on the College Park Campus beginning with the fall of 1969. At the time of the grant it comprised the Law Enforcement Curriculum and a Criminology Program, both of which led to a bachelor of arts degree. It also provided a master of arts program in criminal justice, which was available to the graduate students on the basis of two options, the criminology option and the criminal justice option. Both thesis and nonthesis options were available. There was no Ph.D. program in the Institute. Rather, there was a Ph.D. program in sociology with a specialization in criminology and there was a plan, approved by the Board of Regents at the time of the establishment of the Institute in 1969, to ultimately transfer this doctoral program to the Institute. When the Institute was established in the fall of 1969, it contained only the Law Enforcement Curriculum. At that time the Institute was located in the College of Arts and Sciences as an independent academic unit, reporting directly to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. With the introduction of the divisional structure, the Institute became

a part of the Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences, reporting directly to the Provost of that Division.

In the fall of 1973 the number of undergraduate students was 115 in the Criminology Program and 217 in the Law Enforcement Curriculum, and there were approximately 38 graduate students in the M.A. program. The Institute had eight regular faculty lines, one of which was that of the Director of the Institute, and seven graduate assistantships.

The history of the development of the Institute was described by its Director, Dr. Peter P. Lejins, in a publication issued by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration under the title of Introducing a Law Enforcement Curriculum at a State University. This publication gives in great detail the history of the development of the Institute, its philosophy, its purposes, the rationale of its curriculum, etc. For a person interested in the full picture of the implementation of the Consortium grant, familiarity with this publication would be very helpful.

For an understanding of the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology, familiarity with the basics of the Criminology Program and its history is quite essential, especially since the last steps in the complete integration of the two programs took place under the Consortium grant. Therefore a brief statement regarding the Criminology Program, following closely the description appearing in the above-mentioned publication, is given here.

THE CRIMINOLOGY PROGRAM OR DIVISION OF
CRIMINOLOGY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

The beginnings of a formalized criminology program at the University of Maryland are to be found in the mid forties. Already in the thirties a basic course in criminology was available. This program emerged gradually from these very modest beginnings in the form of a course or courses in the area of criminology offered in the Department of Sociology. This was fairly customary in many departments of sociology in the United States at that time. With the coming of the present writer to the Department of Sociology of the University of Maryland in 1941 in the capacity of a sociologist specializing in criminology, the number of courses in criminology gradually increased. To the conventional course in criminology, in 1942 a course in Juvenile Delinquency was added, and a year or two later courses in Crime and Delinquency Prevention and Institutional Treatment of Criminals and Delinquents. Graduate seminars were also introduced. This attracted a group of students, both on the undergraduate and graduate levels, who were majoring, or doing graduate work, in sociology, with specialization in criminology on the B.A., M.A., or Ph.D. levels. Thus graduate study in criminology, inclusive of Ph.D. level study, was available in Maryland already in the early forties. In 1946 a "Crime and Delinquency Prevention and Control Curriculum" was officially introduced and appeared in the catalog for the first time, known mostly by the abbreviated name of Crime Control Curriculum. The first Ph.D. in sociology with specialization in

criminology was granted in 1947. Gradually a number of graduate students specializing in criminology became involved in teaching undergraduate courses in the area of criminology because of increasing enrollments which were indicative of the growing interest in the field. In 1964 a second instructor of professorial level was employed in the department, specifically for the purpose of teaching courses in criminology. In 1964 the curriculum was transformed into a division of the Department of Sociology under the name of Criminology Program, with the understanding that a certain number of instructors (four) would be teaching courses exclusively in the area of criminology, and the division was given a certain amount of autonomy in managing the affairs pertaining to this area. In 1965 a third staff member of professorial level was added for the purpose of teaching courses in criminology. About this time the number of undergraduate students in the Department of Sociology who officially registered as specializing in criminology went beyond 80, at times going as high as 100. The number of graduate students fluctuated around 30, with about 20 working toward their M.A. and about 10 candidates working on their Ph.D. degrees. At the time when the Criminology Program was established as a division of the Department of Sociology, the position of Director of the Criminology Program was also created.

It should be noted that throughout the existence of the Crime Control Curriculum, or the Criminology Program, sociology students majoring in that program were required to "major in

sociology, have a 'minor' or supportive sequence in psychology, and at least five courses in the area of criminology: Introductory Criminology, Juvenile Delinquency, Prevention of Crime and Delinquency, Institutional Treatment of Criminals and Delinquents, and Treatment of Criminals and Delinquents in the Community." The opportunity to earn up to six credits for field experience in correctional settings had been available for some time for students taking the Criminology Program. On the graduate level, four seminars in the area of criminology were available, as well as a number of graduate tutorial courses which offered the opportunity to study or do research on a specialized topic under the guidance of a faculty member in the Criminology Program.

From the above description it is obvious that the Criminology Program at the University of Maryland was a program dealing with the problems of crime and delinquency, their prevention and their control from the point of view of the behavioral sciences. Law enforcement (police science) was not dealt with at all. It also should be noted that while labeled "Division of Criminology," the program actually served as an academic introduction also to the field of corrections, and a large number of students graduating from this program went into correctional work.

ADULT CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT
AND CORRECTIONS--UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

An understanding of both the history and the present functioning of the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology as one of the Consortium programs is possible only if one has a clear understanding of the functions performed by another component part of the University of Maryland--the University College. This is especially important since there is a considerable difference between the usual programs in criminal justice in institutions of higher education in the United States and the University of Maryland. This difference consists in the fact that, while most of the criminal justice educational programs combine the education of pre-service college-age personnel with the education of part-time in-service adult students, at the University of Maryland these two programs have from the very beginning been operated administratively quite separately. The Institute represents primarily a higher education program on the B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. level for pre-service college-age students and graduate students who are continuing their education in the area of criminal justice more or less directly following the B.A. degree. The University College, on the other hand, handles the part-time adult extension service which caters primarily to the in-service law enforcement and correctional personnel of the state and the surrounding area. The distinction is not absolute, since there are in the M.A. and Ph.D. programs of the Institute students who are already professionally employed in the field of criminal justice, but most

of these are studying either full time or very nearly full time on the basis of fellowships, assistantships, releases from work, etc. The distinction further consists in the fact that the University College extension programs are primarily on the undergraduate level, with a very small number of graduate courses being offered in some areas. The University College either offers individual courses, manages certificate programs for 30 or 60 credit hours, or offers bachelor of science degrees. There is no graduate program in the University College. Therefore, the Consortium grant, which was clearly intended for the purpose of developing or strengthening doctoral programs in the area of criminal justice, does not involve the University College. On the other hand, there is a close connection between the Institute and the University College in the criminal justice education area in the sense that the University College--not only in the area of criminal justice but in all of its programs--teaches primarily courses which are offered by the regular departments of the University, and its instructional personnel must be approved by the subject-matter departments in the University program. Thus, while administered through the University College, the courses taught on a part-time basis to in-service personnel are the same courses that are being taught in the regular day program in the Institute, and all of the teaching personnel are approved by the Institute. From the practical point of view of reporting criminal justice activities, the reports of the Institute do

not include close to a thousand part-time students, mostly law enforcement and corrections personnel, who each semester enroll in University College courses.

Part-time instruction by University College has been available since 1947, and from the beginning course work for credit in criminology and related subjects was offered for the law enforcement and correctional workers of the state and of the region. Certificate programs were introduced later. Throughout this period, noncredit activities consisting of institutes, conferences, and seminars in virtually all areas of criminal justice have been conducted by the University College. Some of these activities are funded by substantial public and private grants and are of local, state, or national scope.

The relationship between the extension teaching and noncredit activities of the University College and the educational activities of the Institute has been one of close and friendly cooperation. It should also be mentioned that the extension programs of the University College have been receiving the major portion of very substantial LEEP funds provided each year to the University since the very beginning of the LEAA programs.

In terms of the history of higher education in criminal justice at the University of Maryland, it should be pointed out that efforts to develop an Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology, which resulted in the establishment of the present Institute in 1969, were the result of a joint effort of the then very active Criminology Program in the Department of Sociology and the University College. The direct interest of the

University College was the development on campus of a substantive academic unit teaching in the area of law enforcement so that, in line with the above-described organizational pattern, the University College could offer, in extension, courses in the area of criminal justice and especially law enforcement to the law enforcement personnel, since up to that time the University College could teach only in the area of criminology and corrections the courses offered by the Criminology Program. This close relationship continues as far as undergraduate extension education is concerned. The University College involvement in the Consortium development is minimal, since--as previously indicated--the University College does not have a graduate program. Of course the indirect impact of the Consortium can be readily felt because many of the in-service personnel, who gradually acquire credit through the University College extension courses and obtain a B.S. degree with a primary concentration in law enforcement, continue in the graduate program of the Institute. An important factor is also the fact that the University College programs offer teaching opportunities to the advanced graduate students of the Institute, thus serving as an additional form of financial assistance, especially to the mature Ph.D. candidates in the Institute's programs.

THE CONSORTIUM GRANT

The Consortium grant to the University of Maryland was made on November 1, 1973, in the amount of \$650,000, with the termination date of June 30, 1976. The official title of the grant was Educational Development Grant Number 74-CD-99-0002.

The grant was made in terms of Section 406(e) of Title I. The date of the application was October 22, 1973. It should be explained that the project narrative and budget were prepared in the course of the months of September and October in close and practically constant contact with the pertinent officials of the LEAA.

Since all Consortium grants were based on the applications made by the respective universities and differed from one another, it is of some interest to set forth the essential characteristics of the University of Maryland grant.

First of all, perhaps, it should be pointed out that the grant contained \$50,000 for an "International Component." No further elaboration appeared in the budget. The program narrative stated that this money was earmarked for the development of the international component of the program, consisting of comparative criminology in general criminal justice studies in cooperation with appropriate organizations and agencies abroad. Detailed plans for this component of the program were to be worked out as the corresponding activities of the Consortium became more definite and contacts were developed abroad. The assignment of funds was provided for by budget amendment. It appears relevant to speculate that the involvement of the Director of the University of Maryland program in international aspects of criminal justice and criminology was the reason for selecting this particular university for a special assignment in the area of international studies.

An analysis of the program narrative and the budget clearly indicate the direct strong commitment to the stated principal

purpose of the Consortium: "the express and explicit purpose of 'building or strengthening' graduate programs in criminal justice or directly related studies at the doctoral level."

The key item was the provision for five visiting professorships to expand "the present program in terms of more inclusive coverage of criminal justice subject matter through a greater variety of courses and seminars and the achievement of the interdisciplinary character of studies, as more fully reflecting the nature of the criminal justice field." The five professorships are specified as: 1) a faculty member with educational background in psychology; 2) a faculty member with educational background in public administration; 3) an additional professorial position for an expert in conventional criminology, to provide a broader scope of course offerings in the area of general criminology and permit offering a greater number of courses and seminars on the graduate level; 4) a professorship in research, to satisfy the need for guidance of graduate students in the development of research designs and methodologies for their theses, dissertations, and other kinds of research which they may undertake in the course of their studies. This research professor is also intended to serve as the Research Director specified in the Consortium Agreement; 5) lastly a new professorial position with the chief function of recruiting minority graduate students, whose role in the field of criminal justice is being recognized more and more. A nationwide search for the best available candidates was thus contemplated. This staff member was also expected to organize

a placement service for the graduates of the program and for the Consortium. The person in question was required to teach at least one course in order to maintain direct contact with the student body.

The exact rank of the above five new staff members was left relatively open, with the hope that at least one or two of these positions might be filled at the full professor level, with the balance rated as associate and assistant professors.

In order to secure a more direct involvement of the existing faculty in the immediate purposes of the Consortium grant, funds were provided for three faculty members to be released one-third of their teaching time for research projects. It was expected that the faculty members' involvement in these projects would make it possible to involve several graduate students in the research, thus facilitating their own research for the purpose of obtaining their doctoral degrees. Two of the projects for which release time was secured were "The relationship between the organizational models of police departments and report crime data," and "Experimental educational experiences designed for undergraduate and graduate students pursuing a career in criminal justice." A third project, for which no release time was provided, however, dealt with "Differential methods in handling offenders by offense categories, offender types, and individual characteristics."

Eight graduate assistantships were created with the following purposes in mind:

1. To serve as an academic apprenticeship for graduate students in teaching methods and research in close association with and under the supervision of a faculty member.
2. To provide the faculty members with a certain amount of assistance in discharging their teaching function and doing research.
3. To provide financial aid for graduate students in need thereof.

The grant provided funding for two conferences:

1. A graduate and curriculum development conference over and above the opportunities offered by the Consortium.

2. A conference with broad invitational participation in the area of private security. It was planned to organize the conference around two themes to be treated in their interrelationship: the polarization of public and private security and the strategies for counteracting this trend; and education and training for the field of private security.

The grant provided for an administrative assistant and for two full-time secretaries. It provided for travel for the general management of the Consortium, for staff recruitment, and for the recruitment and placement of minority students.

The grant also provided for some office equipment and supplies.

ADMINISTRATION

The Consortium grant narrative specifies that the grant was to be handled by the Director of the Institute as the "Director of the Project," in cooperation with two project advisors representing the graduate study options in criminal justice and criminology.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GRANT

Perhaps the most central issue in the implementation of the grant in terms of the Consortium Agreement was the transfer of the existing Ph.D. program in sociology with specialization in criminology, which had been designated a division of the Department of Sociology and was identified as the Criminology Program, to the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology. As has already been mentioned, the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology was established with the fall semester of 1969. In accordance with the proposal for the Institute approved by the Board of Regents of the University, the Criminology Program was at the outset to be continued as part of the Department of Sociology. The approved proposal stated, however, that it was anticipated that in due time the program would be transferred to the Institute. Such transfer occurred beginning with the fall of 1972 with reference to the undergraduate component of the Criminology Program. Beginning with the spring semester of 1973, the master's program was also transferred to the Institute. Thus at the time of receipt of the Consortium grant, the Institute was operating, in addition

to its original Law Enforcement Curriculum, also the Criminology Program leading to the B.A. and M.A. degrees. The Ph.D. program was still within the Department of Sociology, as a specialization in criminology.

Thus the preparatory work for the ultimate transfer of the Ph.D. program to the Institute was begun considerably before any Consortium grant was contemplated. Mention in the Consortium Agreement and the grant of a Ph.D. or doctoral program in criminal justice as well as receipt of the grant by the Institute clearly served as an important factor, however, in speeding up the transfer. It should be pointed out that none of those obstacles which are described in considerable detail in the previously mentioned publication, Introducing a Law Enforcement Curriculum at a State University, presented themselves with regard to the transfer of the Ph.D. program. By that time the climate of attitudes at the University of Maryland and, one might surmise, at the majority of the universities in the United States was much more amenable to accepting higher education programs in the area of criminal justice. First of all, national recognition of the field of criminal justice as a legitimate field for higher education had by then reached the university communities. Secondly, the fact that at that time even many of the most distinguished universities were introducing such programs was an important factor. Thirdly, the fact that there was a major grant to support such a program could not fail to create a favorable disposition toward

the transfer. A very important factor was, of course, the existence of the program as a specialization in criminology in the Department of Sociology since 1946. This made it possible to interpret the transfer not as the creation of a new program, which might have been opposed, but as what it actually was, namely, the transfer of the program--together with a certain expansion beyond the field of theoretical criminology, prevention and correction--to the balance of the field of criminal justice.

But there remained, of course, many conditions to be met, notably the usual requirements for the observance of standards for the Ph.D. degree in a different academic unit. Questions had to be answered pertaining to the numerical size of the graduate faculty, the competence of that faculty in the various areas of the field of criminal justice to ensure that the Ph.D. candidate would have a sufficiently broad opportunity for that type of study, the corresponding variety of courses offered in the program, the opportunities for Ph.D. level research and the availability of the necessary supervision, etc. All these conditions were carefully checked by the Graduate Council of the University in a number of hearings, which required the presentation of detailed plans for the program and justification or demonstration of the ability to maintain the necessary standards. In the end, however, with the cooperation of the University faculty and administration, approval came relatively soon. As of January 21, 1974, that is less than three months after

CONTINUED

3 OF 4

receipt of the grant, the Criminology Program was transferred to the Institute. Thus, the first major requirement of the grant--a Ph.D. program under the title of Criminal Justice and Criminology--was met. Its detailed content and description, reflected in a number of bulletins, will be described at a later point of this report.

The official transfer of the program, which came after the beginning of the spring semester of 1974, the first full semester of operation under the Consortium grant, was of course not the end of the process of implementation. It was just the beginning of a vast number of curricular and administrative details which could now be accomplished. Some of these were introduced with ease; others met with considerable resistance and delays and took time to be implemented.

Curiously enough one of the major delays was the securing of secretarial personnel for the program on the basis of the funding provided by the Consortium grant. The personnel office of the University took very considerable time to identify the positions specified and set them up as positions within the Maryland classified employee structure. The main obstacle appeared to be that the salaries provided by the grant were at first interpreted by the University's personnel office as being too high in comparison to the functions and qualifications required by the Maryland State Classified Employee System. Thus considerable delays ensued, and it was not until the middle of the spring semester that the positions were properly identified,

authorizations were received, and the search for candidates could be seriously started. Classified personnel have always presented a serious problem at the University of Maryland because of the competitively more attractive positions of a similar nature in the federal government. It became necessary to employ temporary personnel on an hourly basis, and frequent changes created a need for constant retraining every time a new person appeared. An additional complication arose when the principal secretary of the Institute, who had worked with the program since its very inception, left the position and had to be replaced. It was not really until the beginning of the fall semester of 1974 that the clerical situation of the program was reasonably stabilized.

FACULTY RECRUITMENT

For a person not involved in the operation of academic programs at major universities, the securing of funds for faculty positions may appear as the major factor, and the assumption is often made that once the money is there, faculty can be obtained. Nothing can be further from the truth, the moment quality standards are maintained. There were, moreover, certain specific conditions about the Consortium grant which made recruitment especially difficult. The grant, formulated as a three-year grant, actually was a two-and-a-half-year grant as far as the University of Maryland was concerned, since it did not materialize until November of academic year 73-74. Like every grant limited in time, it provided only for visiting

positions, which is a tremendous handicap in the recruitment of quality academic personnel. Coming in November, the grant was too late to recruit anybody on a permanent basis beginning with the spring semester, since, again, it is a rare occasion that a qualified person is without a job at that time of the academic year. Recruiting for the second year of the Consortium meant recruiting for only two years. As was mentioned before, intentions were expressed by the University administration to make every effort to continue at least some of the faculty positions developed under Consortium funding. But this did not become a firm commitment until relatively late. Besides, in view of the nationally well-known difficulties with university budgets, many people would not give credibility to such intentions, simply assuming that while the intentions were there, the budgetary facilities to implement them would be lacking when Consortium funding expired. Continuance of Consortium funding beyond June 30, 1976, although hoped for, was also an uncertainty. The frequent mention of the fact that, in view of the budgetary difficulties of most universities, it was a buyer's market was simply not true as far as qualified faculty was concerned. Because of the instability and decreases in university budgets, quality faculty were very hesitant to leave tenured positions, or positions which promised tenure, for temporary positions with some vague hopes of perhaps becoming permanent, even if these positions offered a higher rank and a higher salary. Recruitment for the third year of the Consortium was especially difficult, because it

was possible really to invite anyone only as a visiting professor for a year. It would be quite natural that anyone else, practically with the moment of his/her arrival on campus, would start looking for a position for the next year. The extent of dedication of the faculty to the program of the Institute became quite problematic under such circumstances. With a B.A. program or even an M.A. program, the above obstacles might not be so crucial. But when Ph.D. level faculty has to be employed these obstacles become very serious. Dr. Robert Carter, Director of the Center for Administration of Justice at the School of Public Administration of the University of Southern California, who was invited by LEAA to evaluate the University of Maryland Consortium program in 1975, picked up this basic difficulty very well in his report and mentioned it as a major obstacle in the development of the program. A curious situation came about. While the third year of the program was supposed to represent the culmination of the effort to strengthen the Ph.D. program and presumably a maximal number of Ph.D. candidates would by that time be doing their seminar work and be working on their dissertations under the guidance of faculty employed on Consortium budget lines and therefore quite concerned about a position for the next year. In many cases, such faculty could be more involved in seeking and exploring new employment opportunities than in the work of their charges.

Fortunately, the divisional administration at the University of Maryland, that is, Provost Dr. Berry, who then headed the Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences, was very

cooperative in this respect. One additional permanent budget line was established in the Institute with the beginning of academic year 75-76, and several additional budget lines were requested of the Chancellor in order to absorb the more-than-likely termination of Consortium funding with the end of spring semester 1976. Of essence was, of course, the timing of the transfer of these lines, which would ensure several faculty members of employment after academic year 75-76.

Rigorous emphasis on the quality of the faculty was maintained in the Institute with regard to the Consortium grant. The general practice of the University is that no person without a terminal degree in his or her field, i.e., usually a Ph.D. degree, is accepted for any professorial rank. And a person with a recently completed doctoral degree is employed as an assistant professor. A considerable volume of publications or exceptional teaching ability are required for promotion to a tenured rank. All of these conditions were rigorously observed in the employment and search for the Consortium-budgeted faculty, since it was meant to be faculty capable of guiding Ph.D. studies. There was one exception to these qualifications. Since it was obviously impossible to obtain qualified graduate faculty on short notice, the policy was resorted to of employing personnel suitable for teaching introductory and in general undergraduate courses, in that way releasing senior faculty from handling such courses in order to concentrate on graduate students and the guidance of master's theses and Ph.D. dissertations. A considerable number of the faculty

employed throughout the Consortium period were this type of faculty.

THE STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE GRADUATE PROGRAM IN
CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND CRIMINOLOGY

THE CONTENT OF THE GRADUATE PROGRAM
OF THE DIVISION OF CRIMINOLOGY

The structure and content of the graduate program in criminal justice and criminology as developed under the impact of the Consortium grant was, of course, strongly influenced by the program as it existed at the time the grant was received. The program is subject to the general rules governing all graduate programs at the University of Maryland, College Park Campus, the University as a whole, and, in the final analysis, by the policies laid down by the Board of Regents. Structurally and administratively this involves the respective academic units in the given field, i.e., the graduate faculty and student representatives, then the Deans of the colleges and, under the new organizational plan, the Provosts; the Graduate Dean and the Graduate Council, as well as the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; the College Park Campus Senate and its appropriate committees, the Chancellor of the College Park Campus, the University Vice President for Graduate Study and Research, the University Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and the Board of Regents. All of these academic entities come into play before any graduate program can be approved or modified. Finally, the policies of the Maryland Council on Higher Education must be observed. Although some

modifications in procedures and some minor changes in policies have occurred, the basic policies and procedures have remained essentially the same, so that the development of the Institute's graduate program under the Consortium grant has been very much in line with the academic policies which have governed graduate education at Maryland for a long time.

At this point it might be well to recapitulate the status of graduate education in the area of criminal justice and criminology as it existed at the time the Consortium grant was received.

The Criminology Program, which, as has already been pointed out, was in operation at Maryland as early as 1946, was first located in the Department of Sociology. This is understandable, since for all practical purposes all academic criminology in the United States, from its very inception, has been a subject matter handled by the sociologists. This meant that the analysis of the crime problem and the remedies for it consisted in the application of sociological theories and methodologies to the phenomenon of crime. For decades the American criminologist was a sociologist specializing in criminology who also utilized data from other disciplines of social science (e.g., anthropology, psychology, psychiatry, and economics), but did so qua sociologist. Neither anthropology departments nor psychology departments nor, for that matter, law schools, as a rule, ever taught any criminology. Thus the situation at the University of Maryland reflected the national picture.

Awareness that sociology is not the only social science discipline which is qualified to analyze the phenomenon of crime and that the latter should be subjected to an interdisciplinary approach gradually made itself felt, especially in the 1960's. This awareness was an important factor in the creation of the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology at the University of Maryland in 1969. To a large extent its purpose was to create a setting for the interdisciplinary study of the crime problem rather than a study committed exclusively to the sociological point of view and limited to those who academically qualify as sociologists. In 1969 the Criminology Program was temporarily left with the Department of Sociology, but the anticipation of its transfer was clearly indicated in the proposal for the Institute approved by the Board of Regents.

The above background makes very clear two essential characteristics of the Maryland program:

1. Students who undertake the study of criminology are first of all considered to be sociologists or social scientists who happen to specialize in criminology, thus applying the principles and methods of social and behavioral science to the problem of crime and its control and prevention.
2. The program is very strongly an academic program. It is not directed toward the training of practitioners but rather--and especially on the graduate level--to the education of social scientists familiar with the

problem of crime and to the development of a social science of crime, inclusive of research and evaluational research.

Located until 1972 in the College of Arts and Sciences and offering, on the graduate level, research degrees of Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy, the Criminology Program was actually barred from becoming an applied program. Such courses as field training were very much limited in terms of permissible credit hours and had to be interpreted as a supplement to academic training rather than preparation for practical careers in the area of corrections. All this does not, of course, mean that persons receiving the B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees in that program did not have an excellent educational background for entering a career, for instance, in corrections, as very many of them did.

THE CONTENT OF THE GRADUATE PROGRAM IN THE INSTITUTE

When the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology was established with a Curriculum in Law Enforcement, the same educational philosophy prevailed. Although clearly interdisciplinary rather than tied to one single academic discipline, the Institute and the Curriculum were in the College of Arts and Sciences and were intended as the academic study of the processes and agencies of law enforcement rather than a professional education program. When the graduate degree programs were transferred to the Institute, they were research degrees and not professional degrees. It should be reiterated that

this by no means meant an abdication from the preparation of professionals for the field, since the country has gradually been moving toward recognition of the importance of this type of education for those who engage in practical professional careers.

The above orientation of the graduate criminal justice and criminology program at Maryland has an impact, of course, on the qualifications and recruitment of faculty. For the faculty in the Institute, a research doctorate in one of the disciplines of behavioral or social science is a standard requirement. The only exception is the faculty teaching courses in the area of criminal law and procedure, which are considered an essential component in education in the area of the crime problem. A law degree from a law school is a prerequisite in this case, with additional research degrees, as a rule, required for permanent faculty positions in the Institute.

An important factor in this development at Maryland has been the fact that the education for in-service personnel, both in law enforcement and corrections, has never been the task of the Criminology Program, or, later, of the Institute. This function is performed by the extension and adult education branch of the University, that is, the University College, which manages most of the course work, also under the LEEP funding, for Maryland police and correctional workers. This does not mean that there are not at least a few students, both on the undergraduate and the graduate levels, who are working for degrees in the Institute who at one time were or currently

are employed in law enforcement or corrections. But these are not taking just a few random courses but are pursuing a regular degree course of study on the basis of various kinds of arrangements which made this possible through leave with or without pay, or by actually leaving the agency in which they were working. Thus, with very few exceptions, the undergraduate students of the Institute are full-time college-age students, and most of the graduate students are studying full-time, supported by fellowships, graduate assistantships, or personal funds.

The above-described character of the graduate program of the Institute determines the course requirements. Both the M.A. and the Ph.D. programs can be broadly analyzed as made up of three components:

1. A set of courses and seminars in the area of criminal justice and criminology offered by the Institute and constituting the "major" for the student;
2. Work in the area of a social or behavioral science discipline selected by the student and taken in the respective department as a "minor" or supportive sequence;
3. A set of tool courses--statistics, methodology, and computer science--which constitute a second minor for the student and are taken preferably in the same social or behavioral science department selected by the student under 2 above. These subjects are not taught

by the Institute faculty except for a specialized course in the methodology of criminal justice and criminology.

After three years of gradual development of the Law Enforcement Curriculum and build-up of an adequate faculty and the necessary administrative setting in the Institute, the undergraduate phase of the Criminology Program was transferred from the Department of Sociology to the Institute, at which time the faculty of the Criminology Program of that department was also transferred to the Institute together with its budget. This transfer occurred with the fall semester of 1972. The transfer of the M.A. phase of the program was considered simultaneously, but the authorization to accept graduate students seeking the M.A. degree directly into the Institute was finalized only for the spring semester of 1973. The arguments used in the establishment of the Institute (see the above-cited publication Introducing a Law Enforcement Curriculum at a State University), and advanced before the appropriate University authorities, were: the need and advantages of having an academic unit encompassing the entire field of criminal justice; preference for an interdisciplinary approach to the problems of crime and its handling both on the undergraduate and graduate levels; as well as citation of the policies of the funding agencies, especially those of the recently created Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, in promoting educational facilities which provide the student with a total view of the criminal justice system, its theory and practice, and its subsystems

It has already been observed that the transfer of the undergraduate and graduate levels of the Criminology Program to the Institute, as well as later on, after the establishment of the Consortium, the transfer of the Ph.D. program, met with much less resistance than the original move to establish a special degree-granting Institute in 1969. It appears that once the concept of university-level education in the law enforcement area was sold to the administration, but especially the faculty of the University, further modifications and expansion met primarily with the conventional review of the qualifications and strength of the program to take on additional responsibilities. Once such readiness was established, there was not much resistance to additions and changes. Another important factor was the example, at this stage, of a number of substantial universities having followed a similar path, while in 1969 the introduction of an Institute of Criminal Justice was still highly innovative. Again, the favorable disposition of the federal funding agencies, especially at that time of the LEEP program, was a cogent factor.

THE NATURE OF THE M.A. PROGRAM IN THE INSTITUTE

The M.A. phase of the Criminology Program was transferred to the Institute basically intact with its faculty and budget and all of its M.A. level graduate students (over 20 in all), since the latter all opted for transfer to the Institute rather than selecting the option offered them to continue their degree work in the Department of Sociology. The program was, however,

expanded to offer a criminal justice option in addition to the criminology option to students seeking M.A. degrees. The terminology "criminal justice" was decided upon in the case of graduate studies rather than the term "law enforcement" used for the undergraduate curriculum. The justification for the addition of the law enforcement option was the basic philosophy and policies of the Institute encompassing the total field of criminal justice.

While the Department of Sociology and hence also the Criminology Program had experimented in the past with various plans for the master's degree, at times requiring a master's thesis, at times requiring comprehensive examinations, etc., the graduate faculty of the Institute decided and secured approval for an M.A. degree with two options--a thesis and a non-thesis option--in the latter case with required comprehensive examinations and research papers. The anticipation was that students planning careers in teaching and research would select the thesis option, while those studying in preparation for a career in the criminal justice agencies would be more likely to opt for additional course work and comprehensive examinations. So far, the thesis option is preferred by far.

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

The admission requirements for the M.A. program comprise, first of all, the general Graduate School requirements of the University of Maryland. The departments are given a considerable amount of latitude and discretion in making additional

stipulations. A 3.0 grade point average for undergraduate study is generally expected, with a very slight downward deviation occasionally permitted when special circumstances warrant. Some attention is given to the grade point averages and grades in specific courses, such as the grade point averages in the undergraduate social science major--especially the grade in theory, the grade point average in criminal justice and criminology, and the grades in statistics and methodology. A criminal justice and/or criminology major or a social or behavioral science major is given decided preference and should probably be considered a requirement as far as policy is concerned. Graduate Record Examinations are required. The combined qualitative and quantitative scores are expected to total at least 1000 and in competitive admissions often are supposed to be higher. A strong recommendation is usually made to postpone the application to graduate school until the GRE requirement is satisfied. In a few cases, conditional admission is granted without the GRE's, with the understanding that these will be passed at a satisfactory level at the first opportunity. Three letters of recommendation from academic faculty familiar with the applicant's work are required, as well as a statement by the applicant on his/her goals and purposes in entering the program in criminal justice and criminology. Needless to say, the standing of the undergraduate college or university is given strong consideration. All of the above qualifications are considered as minimum requirements but are raised when, because of the number of applicants, competitive standards have

to be applied. Current national policies in the interpretation of undergraduate performance are taken into consideration in view of the cultural factors affecting minority applicants. Foreign students are expected to meet the same application requirements in addition to language performance tests. Some consideration is given to the different undergraduate program structure in the institutions of higher education in the foreign countries.

Conditional admission may be considered when any of the above requirements are lacking, provided the graduate faculty or its committee considers this warranted. Typical cases of conditional admission comprise the absence of the GRE scores, absence of undergraduate level work in the area of criminal justice or criminology, or absence of statistics and/or methodology courses in undergraduate preparation. In some cases (as a rule in the case of lacking GRE's), formal conditional admission is granted. In some other cases, official full admission is granted with a statement in the letter of admission that the student must make up the lacking prerequisites without credit toward the M.A. degree. In most cases, the absence of prerequisites both in a social science discipline and in statistics and methodology means denial of admission until such prerequisites are made up. A few exceptions are made in very outstanding cases of applicants who are otherwise extremely highly qualified academically.

The above policy of waiver of prerequisites is based on the position taken by the Institute's graduate faculty that a

change in the field of study at the end of the undergraduate phase and at entry into the graduate program at the M.A. level is tolerable, and in many cases fully acceptable, given a general high academic performance level of the applicant. For example, a graduate in psychology who has demonstrated a high level of performance but did not have the opportunity to take any course work in criminal justice or criminology may be readily admitted with the understanding that such course work will be made up and that the more advanced courses in this area will be postponed until such time.

All the above requirements are very much in line with the admissions requirements which were observed in the Criminology Program when it was in the Sociology Department and, by and large, reflect the policies of most of the social and behavioral science departments on campus. The specific criminal justice and criminology considerations have, of course, been built in by the graduate faculty of the Institute.

THE NATURE OF THE PH.D. PROGRAM IN THE INSTITUTE

The philosophy accepted by the graduate faculty of the Institute as underlying the Ph.D. program is one of maximum possible freedom for the doctoral level student to select the specific area of interest and a course of study in accordance with his or her interests and need, in consultation with a faculty advisor and a Ph.D. committee. Accordingly, requirements in terms of specific courses are minimal for the Ph.D. program. Quality controls are maintained by rigorously observed

admission standards and four required comprehensive examinations testing the candidate's competence in the general theory and knowledge of the field of criminal justice and criminology, in the specialization area selected by the candidate from that field, in the theory of a social or behavioral science discipline of the student's choice, and in research methods and statistics. The course work must be completed, as in the case of the M.A. student, with at least a B average. Preparation and defense of a doctoral dissertation with the advice of an advisor and the supervision of a committee is, of course, required.

In principle, it is not specified what courses the student is to take to prepare himself for the comprehensives, although de facto the availability of courses in the Institute to a large extent determines at least the basic courses the student will take. Credit for course work at another institution with the specific approval, in each case, of the Institute is fully acceptable. The selection of areas of specialization by the Ph.D. candidate is, of course, limited by the availability of faculty competent to conduct doctoral level study in a specific area. There is no language requirement in the doctoral program of the Institute, competence in such tool courses as statistics, methodology, and computer science being considered a substitute for such requirement. Preparation for the comprehensives in the social or behavioral science and in the tool courses is construed as the required minors in the respective departments, as was pointed out in the case of the M.A. program.

So far the doctoral students have met with a cooperative attitude on the part of the departments involved. A representative of each of the two minors serves on the committee administering the comprehensive examinations and is instrumental for the preparation and evaluation of such an examination.

The perception of the Institute's graduate faculty, strongly prompted and supported by the Dean of the Graduate School in a meeting with the graduate faculty at the time that the transfer of the Ph.D. program from the Department of Sociology to the Institute was being considered, is that on the doctoral level the total field of criminal justice--including criminology, corrections, and whatever other areas the faculty of the Institute may develop competence in--should be embraced. Involvement of the total graduate faculty in the Ph.D. program rather than dividing them by assignment to different options within the program was an important consideration. The idea that the unity of the field would provide a broader perspective and be completely in line with the U. S. trends of the last seven-eight years to develop the idea of the total field of criminal justice and consider this field as a system to be analyzed and planned for was, of course, also of considerable importance. Accordingly, in contrast to the M.A. program, the Ph.D. program does not have any specific options. As was already indicated, each Ph.D. candidate is given an opportunity to carve out for himself an area of specialization and to back this up with the general requirements included in the Ph.D.

program. This idea of the unity of the subject matter in the Ph.D. program is further buttressed by courses and seminars which encompass the total field of criminal justice. Thus, with the transfer of the Ph.D. program to the Institute, a seminar in criminal justice was introduced (LENF 600) which was to serve as an introduction, on the graduate level, to the total field of criminal justice, emphasizing the aspects which permeate the entire field. Although the course nomenclature indicates law enforcement, this is no more than a technicality. Actually the course is intended to cover both the criminal justice and the criminology aspects of the field. This is one course specifically required of both M.A. and Ph.D. students in the Institute. Other courses, such as Criminal Justice System Planning (LENF 720) and Research Methods in Criminal Justice and Criminology (CRIM 610), also address themselves to the entire field of criminal justice.

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PH.D. PROGRAM

Generally speaking a candidate applying for admission to the Institute's Ph.D. program is expected to have previous academic preparation to the extent of a completed M.A. degree, as that degree is envisaged within the Institute's program. A considerable number of applicants satisfy such a requirement, but there are considerable and frequent deviations even with regard to applicants who have completed an M.A. or M.S. degree in criminal justice and criminology at some other university. These deviations are even greater in the case of persons who

pursued a different course of study in the past and have had only partial preparation in the field.

Basically, as has been pointed out before, the admission requirements for the Ph.D. program are very similar to those for the M.A. program. The student is expected to possess a certain amount of competence in the area of criminal justice and criminology, one of the social or behavioral science disciplines, and in statistics and methodology. In the case of Ph.D. applicants, this competence is supposed to be on the level of a completed M.A. education in these areas.

With regard to research methodologies and statistics, it is expected that the applicant has completed undergraduate and intermediate or M.A. level statistics and methodology courses. With regard to background in a social or behavioral science discipline, it is similarly expected that the candidate has had some graduate work in such a discipline. And in the area of criminal justice and criminology, it is expected that the candidate has done some work on the master's degree level.

In contrast to the admission policy for the M.A. degree, in the case of the Ph.D. program the graduate faculty of the Institute feels that, while a change from another academic field to the field of criminal justice and criminology is understandable and can be honored at the M.A. level, this cannot be the case with regard to the Ph.D. program. The faculty has ruled that it is inconceivable that a student enrolled in the Ph.D. program has no previous preparation in the field, and students without such in the field of criminal justice and

criminology are therefore not admitted and no make-ups after admission are accepted. Thus, if any person without criminal justice and criminology applies for admission to the Ph.D. program in the Institute, he is directed to acquire such academic background before applying. So far the graduate faculty of the Institute and its admission committee have required only three courses in the area of criminal justice and criminology as an absolute prerequisite for admission to the Ph.D. program. It is expected that a more substantial requirement will be drawn up in the future.

The same principle applies to the courses in methodology and statistics which a candidate is supposed to have prior to seeking admission. While in the case of the M.A. student it is considered conceivable that a student can catch up with the requirements of these areas after being admitted, the graduate faculty considers that total absence of preparation in statistics and research methodology is too much of a handicap for a student on the Ph.D. level and does not, as a rule, accept applicants without any preparation in this area.

By and large, the same principle applies to background in a behavioral or social science. This means that a person with no social or behavioral science background on the bachelor or master's level is not admitted, even if these degrees have been earned in a program of study in criminal justice and criminology.

Each Ph.D. candidate is required to appear for a personal interview with the graduate faculty of the Institute or its

committee. The interview plays a very important role in the final admissions decision, although candidates who, on the basis of the written materials submitted, do not appear to have much of a chance of being admitted usually are not encouraged to come for an interview unless the candidate insists.

The Graduate School requires that four members of the dissertation committee be members of the Graduate School, with the chairman--unless a special exception is made--being a full rather than an associate member of the graduate faculty. At least three members of the committee, including the chairman, must be from the Institute. The two remaining members are supposed to represent the department or departments in which the candidate is minoring, that is, one representing the pertinent social or behavioral science department of the Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and one representing the area in which the candidate has taken the methodology and statistics requirement.

At the present time the structure of the committees administering and evaluating the comprehensive examinations has not been fully determined. It is assumed that the membership of the dissertation committee is strongly represented also on the comprehensives committee or committees, but recruitment of additional faculty members, especially from the areas of the two minors, is perfectly possible or will probably take place in the future. The dissertation committees may have additional invited members who do not have to be members of the graduate faculty or, for that matter, be members of the faculty of

the University of Maryland. Their invitation depends on the special qualifications which they may offer in connection with the candidate's subject of study.

JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The Consortium Agreement among the seven universities stipulated joint undertakings in the area of criminal justice regarding cooperative educational and research enterprises, exchange of faculty and students, and, in general, intensive cooperation. One of the more tangible implementations of this plan is the Joint Doctoral Program in Criminal Justice between the University of Maryland and Eastern Kentucky University.

In view of a delay in the approval of Eastern Kentucky University's own graduate program on the doctoral level, representatives of that University began to negotiate with the University of Maryland Institute in order to develop a plan under which graduate students who complete their M.A. degree at Eastern Kentucky would be admitted to the Ph.D. Program in Criminal Justice and Criminology at the University of Maryland provided they meet the usual admission requirement of that program. They would, however, spend an additional year of graduate study at Eastern Kentucky. During that year they would be taking courses and seminars appropriate in terms of the Maryland Ph.D. program up to 30 semester hours. Their work would be supervised and approved by the students' University of Maryland and Eastern Kentucky University advisors. Upon satisfactory completion of course work at Eastern Kentucky University,

the student moves to the University of Maryland as a doctoral student of good standing. His/her further work is supervised by an advisory committee, appointed by the Director of the Institute, which includes one member from the faculty of Eastern Kentucky University College of Law Enforcement. Ph.D. comprehensive examinations are administered by the University of Maryland, and the student's dissertation is supervised by a committee which is also appointed by the Director of the Institute. This committee may include a member of the Eastern Kentucky University faculty on a nonvoting basis. Students in this Joint Doctoral Program are to be provided financial aid by Eastern Kentucky University throughout their course of study.

The negotiations between the two Universities in developing this program can well serve as a model for this type of cooperative arrangement. Two representatives of the graduate faculty of Eastern Kentucky University visited the Maryland campus at an early stage and met with the graduate faculty of the Institute as well as with the Dean of the Graduate School. A number of sample cases of Ph.D. applicants both from Eastern Kentucky University and the University of Maryland, in each case fully documented, were jointly analyzed in considerable detail to ascertain and compare the criteria used in the evaluation of graduate students by both Universities. The Ph.D. study requirements, especially those of the comprehensive examinations, were analyzed, and the nature of the courses preparatory for these examinations, was ascertained. Further details

and possible adjustments were discussed on the occasion of the Consortium Board of Directors meetings, which provided ample opportunity for such contacts. The final proposal made by Eastern Kentucky University was approved by the graduate faculty of the Institute and the Dean of the University of Maryland Graduate School and was declared operative as of June 13, 1974. Since that time a number of potential candidates applying to this program have come to the University of Maryland for interviews, accompanied by a representative of Eastern Kentucky University's graduate faculty. At the time of the termination of the Consortium grants, two such students had been accepted and were on the Maryland campus in the second year of their doctoral studies.

SUPPORT OF GRADUATE STUDENTS

LEAA GRADUATE RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

In the fall of 1973, well ahead of the signing of the Consortium Agreement and prior to receipt of the Consortium grant by the University of Maryland, the then Program Manager for the Consortium informed the prospective Consortium schools that the LEAA Graduate Research Fellowship Program would provide each school with \$50,000 for graduate fellowships each year for a three-year period over and above the basic Consortium grant. This was a very important item of information because it is well known how essential financial aid to graduate students is today, especially for minority graduate students.

The only concern was that, in view of the gradual strengthening of the doctoral program as the result of Consortium activities, the need for fellowships might increase toward the end of the Consortium period and therefore more money might be needed in the second and third years than in the first. As it turned out, the funds awarded to the University of Maryland during the three-year period were \$49,285 the first year, \$28,500 the second year, and \$20,000 the third year, for a total of \$97,785. The last award had as its termination date March 31, 1977, which means that the University of Maryland had the fellowship support for six semesters beginning with the spring semester of 1974. Thus, the fellowship funds awarded were cut back from the originally announced sum by over \$50,000. The Institute continuously indicated the need for greater fellowship support for its expanding Ph.D. program, but apparently the funds were not available. This resulted in the fact that, during the last two semesters, no new fellowships could be granted and only those students who had previously been receiving the fellowships could be continued in their work toward the Ph.D. degree. This meant a serious curtailing of the opportunities to involve additional good Ph.D. candidates. Even the graduate fellowship support given throughout the last Consortium year was to a large extent possible only because of the fact that the University Graduate School waived most of the legitimate allowance to the sponsoring university to which it was entitled, and this money was put into direct fellowship support.

The Institute awarded altogether ten LEAA Graduate Research Fellowships, one finishing the M.A. thesis and nine working on Ph.D. degrees. The M.A. degree, option criminology, was completed by Ms. Kathleen Sedlak at the end of the fall semester of 1975 on the topic "The Effectiveness of Vocational Training Programs on the Successful Employment of Parolees from Patuxent Institution." One Ph.D. degree was completed by Dr. Ronald Tait at the end of the spring semester of 1976 on the topic "The Relationship of Cottage Social Systems to the Adjustment of Training School Boys." It should be noted that at the time of the transfer of the Ph.D. program from the Division of Criminology in the Department of Sociology to the Institute, candidate Tait had progressed toward the Ph.D. degree so far that there was no point in his transferring to the Institute and his doctorate is in sociology with specialization in criminology. The fellowship enabled him, however, to complete the degree much faster than would otherwise have been possible, if at all.

The remaining eight recipients of the LEAA Graduate Research Fellowships were continuing their work on their degrees, and seven of them held such fellowships at the time of the termination of the Consortium grant in the fall semester of 1976. Four of the eight had completed their Ph.D. comprehensives with only the dissertations remaining to be done. Two more had taken two of the four comprehensives, and the remaining two were planning to begin their comprehensives in the near future.

The experience with the LEAA fellowships at Maryland clearly corroborated the fact that graduate, and especially doctoral, students are in most cases absolutely dependent on some form of financial support. Most of the above ten fellows interrupted their regular employment or did not take on employment only because of the availability of the fellowships. One of the fellows gave up a very well-paying professional job in order to devote full time to his doctoral studies. Without the fellowship this would have been impossible.

THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

At the same time that the fellowship program was being planned in the early developmental stage of the Consortium, the internship program also was outlined, with the understanding that funding for such a program would be available. The following is a brief description of what transpired with regard to the internship program during the Consortium period at the University of Maryland.

The University of Maryland had a very active summer internship program funded by the Regional Office (Region III) of LEAA in the two summers preceding the Consortium grant. In the summer of 1972, six interns, funded by LEAA at the cost of \$2400, were placed in various criminal justice agencies under the supervision of Dr. Julius Debro, an Institute faculty member. In the summer of 1973 the sum of \$12,500 was allocated by the Region, and \$12,450 were used for 25 summer interns in a wide variety of criminal justice agencies. Dr. Debro and

Dr. Knowlton Johnson supervised the interns. During that summer the program was construed as a tutorial course for credit, and the University of Maryland Summer School provided the salary for instruction. The interns met regularly as a group during the summer, contact was maintained with the agencies at which the interns were placed, and reports were prepared by the interns on their experience. The program was acknowledged as an outstanding success. Both undergraduate and graduate students participated.

In the summers of 1974 and 1975 similar funding was obtained from the Region. In the summer of 1974 the sum of \$10,400 made it possible to engage 20 interns, and in the summer of 1975 the sum of \$12,480 similarly facilitated an internship program with 24 students. In both of these years, Dr. Knowlton Johnson directed the program, and again the University provided the salary for the supervising instructor so that academic credit was received by the participants on the basis of the criminal justice agency placement. Although the funding for the internships was provided by the Region in the summers of 1974 and 1975 as heretofore, it was understood that this funding was given the University as a Consortium university, even though it did not exceed the funding previously received.

It was a considerable setback for the University not to receive any internship funds from LEAA in the summer of 1976. The LEAA internship program had been reorganized in the method of distribution of funds. The Institute was given to understand that only one university in each Region received a grant

for internships. The absence of internship funding in 1976 disrupted a carefully and laboriously established network of agencies which were ready to receive interns during the summers, and it will take a considerable effort to reestablish this well-functioning program in some shape or manner--if and when funding can be found.

Several other types of internships besides the LEAA summer internships are being handled by the Institute, and the general evaluation is that they constitute a very important component both in the graduate and the undergraduate program, regardless of whether the interns are planning to work in the operational agencies or are enriching their competence as scholars, planners, or researchers by the contact with field operations provided by the internships.

TEACHING BY PH.D. CANDIDATES

The University of Maryland in general maintains the policy that only faculty employed to teach are expected to fulfill this function. Thus, e.g., graduate teaching assistants generally assist the professor but are not responsible for teaching the course. There are some variations in this policy, depending on the needs of the program of the academic unit in question, but as far as the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology is concerned, the graduate teaching assistants are not supposed to teach except for an occasional practice lecture. On the other hand, it is a tradition of long standing in many departments that Ph.D. candidates who hold an M.A. degree and

are very close to completion of their studies and dissertation can be employed as instructors with teaching responsibilities on a part-time, and even full-time, basis. This is being done for the primary purpose of making it financially possible for Ph.D. candidates to continue their studies. Courses taught by such instructors usually are introductory courses or courses in the specialization of the doctoral candidate. As a rule, no graduate student enrollment is permitted in courses so taught. The Institute has been resorting to this practice for some time in order to supplement graduate student income. However, this opportunity is usually available only to two or three students.

Another teaching opportunity for Ph.D. candidates with an M.A. degree is teaching for the University College of the University of Maryland in the field of criminal justice in the extension and continuing education program. This program has been described in an earlier section of this report. A number of Ph.D. candidates of the Institute have been engaged in such teaching for the Institute, and some Consortium grant funds were used for this purpose. The benefits of this teaching experience go beyond the financial-aid aspect: this is valuable experience for the Ph.D. candidates not only in terms of practice teaching but also in stimulating the structuring of their knowledge and their ability to present their views in an organized course.

MINORITY RECRUITMENT

It has already been mentioned that the University of Maryland Consortium grant provided a faculty position with the special function of graduate minority student recruitment. Mr. Lawrence D. Jamison, with the rank of assistant professor, occupied this position for two years beginning with the fall semester of 1974. Adequate funding was provided for visits to various universities which potentially might have minority candidates for the Institute's graduate program. The task was not an easy one, especially since, as was pointed out elsewhere in this report, most minority students require extensive financial support, and even with the LEAA Graduate Research Fellowships and Consortium-funded graduate assistantships, such support was not sufficiently massive to involve a large number of minority students. The statistical picture at the time of termination of the Consortium grant was as follows: Among the 24 Ph.D. students, there were 3 Blacks (13%), 7 women (32%), and 2 foreign students. Among the 53 M.A. students actively enrolled in the program, there were 5 Blacks (13%), 17 women (29%), 1 Spanish-surnamed student, and 2 foreign students. One of the seven LEAA doctoral research fellows was a Black. Among the 15 graduate assistants, 4 were Blacks.

The Institute is committed to an intensive search for funds for increased financial aid to its graduate students and the minority students in particular.

CONFERENCE ACTIVITY--CONSORTIUM RELATED

FIRST NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE SECURITY

The interest in the field of private security on the part of the Institute dates back to its early planning stage. Several curriculum planning conferences of nationally recognized criminal justice educators, convened by the University of Maryland to plan the establishment of the Institute, invariably included a course in private security in the core curriculum. Thus a course in this field was among the first 10 courses offered in the Institute at the time of its establishment in 1969. The Institute was aware of the growing importance of private security in this country and soon engaged an instructor with expertise in this area, who was to further develop courses in this subject matter and advise those students who had an interest in this area. When the Consortium grant for the University of Maryland came up for discussion, a special point was made to include a budget line for a private security conference in order to focus attention on this important--but at that time not very much explored--field. Already at that time two topics, considered of paramount importance, appeared in the budget narrative: "Polarization of public and private security" and "Education and training for the private security field."

The preparatory work was immediately started, but unfortunately, after preparations had progressed, the faculty member in charge left the University for an attractive position in the field. Consequently it took a while for his successor to pick

up the threads. By this time LEAA had placed considerable emphasis on the subject of private security. It established the National Private Security Advisory Council and somewhat later appointed a Task Force on Private Security as part of the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Phase II. The Institute cooperated very closely with the chairman of both the National Private Security Advisory Council and the Task Force on Private Security, Dr. Arthur J. Bilek; with Mr. Irving Slott, who staffed the Advisory Council; and with Mr. Clifford Van Meter, Staff Director of the Private Security Task Force. Their advice was sought and followed both in the structuring of the conference and in selecting the participants.

Following the suggestion of the above advisory group, the conference was titled "First National Conference on Private Security." Forty leaders in the field of private security and some from the field of public security were invited, and the conference took place on December 1-3, 1975, on the College Park campus of the University of Maryland. All of the Consortium universities were invited to participate, and three were represented. Mr. David L. Marvil functioned as Conference Coordinator. The two topics selected in the grant proposal were used as the two themes of the conference. The conference was acclaimed a success by the participants, and a Resolutions Committee, elected by the conference, continued its work long after the meeting. Frequent reference was made to the conference by the Task Force on Private Security in the course of its

deliberations. The proceedings of the conference are in the process of publication as of this writing.

INTERNATIONAL COMPONENT: INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON DOCTORAL LEVEL EDUCATION IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND CRIMINOLOGY

The LEAA Consortium grant to the University of Maryland contained an item, as previously pointed out, entitled "International Component." This was an assignment to the Institute to develop some meaningful activity of international scope which would be related to and supportive of a doctoral program in criminal justice education. Action with regard to this international aspect of the grant was, however, delayed.

The reason for this delay was the exploration of an international Consortium project involving all seven universities. As early as the meeting of the Consortium Board of Directors in conjunction with the signing of the Consortium Agreement in November of 1973, this matter was discussed, and a Consortium committee was elected, with the Maryland Project Director as chairman. This committee spent approximately five months working on a proposal for an all-Consortium international project which would be supported by an additional major grant from LEAA. In line with the authorization by the U. S. Congress in extending LEAA, this project was supposed to deal with the topics of skyjacking, terrorism, or drug traffic. The committee worked in close cooperation with the then Project Manager, and the Consortium Board of Directors discussed these plans at several meetings. In the late spring of 1974, the Project Manage:

was changed, and about that same time it was made clear that LEAA was no longer interested in having the Consortium engage in an international project. As a result, further planning was abandoned.

The work on this all-Consortium international project had a delaying effect on any plans for the use of the funds earmarked for the international component in the Maryland grant, because it was not considered wise to make any plans for a Maryland project while there was a possibility of linking the Maryland activities to the all-Consortium project. Thus it was not until after the all-Consortium project was dropped that planning could go ahead on the Maryland international component.

The following project gradually emerged as the most appropriate utilization of the available funds. The purpose of the LEAA Consortium grant was the "building or strengthening of graduate programs in criminal justice . . . at the doctoral level." This the seven Consortium universities were doing for three years, and some 20 Consortium Board of Directors meetings invariably dealt with the issues of doctoral level education. At the same time a number of other non-Consortium universities also developed doctoral programs in criminal justice. The impetus given to higher education in this field by the LEEP program resulted in an unprecedented expansion, and gradually also the advanced degrees came into the focus of attention. The central concept was that of a unified field under the title of criminal justice, which was to encompass not only all operational activities with regard to crime in one integrated system,

but also conceptually and educationally bring all studies, research, and education together as one unified field. In October 1975 one of the Consortium universities, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, held a conference on doctoral level education in which criminal justice educators from all over the United States took part. Thus, it appeared that the next logical step would be to convene an international conference on the same subject in order to bring the best experience and thinking on this matter in the United States in contact with similar pursuits in other countries. It was hoped that this international exchange of ideas would confront the U. S. patterns of doctoral programs in all facets of the criminal justice system with their counterparts in other countries, bring out advantages and disadvantages, and broaden perspectives on the subject. This was the first international conference of this nature.

With LEAA approval and the enthusiastic support of Dr. J. Price Foster, Director of the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training, the conference was convened on July 7-10, 1976, by the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology on the University of Maryland campus. All Project Directors from the Consortium universities and the Consortium Coordinator were invited to attend, as well as the directors of the criminal justice programs which had recently established the American Association of Doctoral Programs in Criminal Justice and Criminology. The leading educators in the field of criminal justice from abroad were also invited.

was changed, and about that same time it was made clear that LEAA was no longer interested in having the Consortium engage in an international project. As a result, further planning was abandoned.

The work on this all-Consortium international project had a delaying effect on any plans for the use of the funds earmarked for the international component in the Maryland grant, because it was not considered wise to make any plans for a Maryland project while there was a possibility of linking the Maryland activities to the all-Consortium project. Thus it was not until after the all-Consortium project was dropped that planning could go ahead on the Maryland international component.

The following project gradually emerged as the most appropriate utilization of the available funds. The purpose of the LEAA Consortium grant was the "building or strengthening of graduate programs in criminal justice . . . at the doctoral level." This the seven Consortium universities were doing for three years, and some 20 Consortium Board of Directors meetings invariably dealt with the issues of doctoral level education. At the same time a number of other non-Consortium universities also developed doctoral programs in criminal justice. The impetus given to higher education in this field by the LEEP program resulted in an unprecedented expansion, and gradually also the advanced degrees came into the focus of attention. The central concept was that of a unified field under the title of criminal justice, which was to encompass not only all operational activities with regard to crime in one integrated system,

but also conceptually and educationally bring all studies, research, and education together as one unified field. In October 1975 one of the Consortium universities, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, held a conference on doctoral level education in which criminal justice educators from all over the United States took part. Thus, it appeared that the next logical step would be to convene an international conference on the same subject in order to bring the best experience and thinking on this matter in the United States in contact with similar pursuits in other countries. It was hoped that this international exchange of ideas would confront the U. S. patterns of doctoral programs in all facets of the criminal justice system with their counterparts in other countries, bring out advantages and disadvantages, and broaden perspectives on the subject. This was the first international conference of this nature.

With LEAA approval and the enthusiastic support of Dr. J. Price Foster, Director of the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training, the conference was convened on July 7-10, 1976, by the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology on the University of Maryland campus. All Project Directors from the Consortium universities and the Consortium Coordinator were invited to attend, as well as the directors of the criminal justice programs which had recently established the American Association of Doctoral Programs in Criminal Justice and Criminology. The leading educators in the field of criminal justice from abroad were also invited.

The conference was attended by 28 criminal justice educators from 15 countries: 12 from the United States and 16 of their counterparts from abroad. In addition to the United States, countries represented were Belgium, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, Italy, the Ivory Coast, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and Venezuela. A number of observers attended as well, including Gerhard O. W. Mueller, Chief, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Section of the United Nations.

The University of Maryland administration gave its wholehearted support to the conference. Chancellor Gluckstern of the College Park Campus and Chancellor Drazek of the University College welcomed the participants at the opening session. The Honorable Richard W. Velde, LEAA Administrator, and Dr. J. Price Foster, Director of the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training, LEAA, addressed the meeting. The conference was characterized by most intensive and enthusiastic participation by all who attended; the closing session on the fourth day ran way past the appointed hour, with practically all participants present to the end.

As to content, the Chronicle, the official organ of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland, had the following to say:

Perhaps the major issue which surfaced during the conference concerned the clear division between countries in terms of educational philosophy regarding criminal justice education. Representatives from the U. S. and Canada supported the concept of "criminal justice education" as an entity, but by and large the

representatives from European countries voiced strong support for continued emphasis on the individual disciplines which contribute to criminology, i.e. sociology, forensic studies, psychology, psychiatry, correction, but shied away from the notion of bringing them all together "under one umbrella." This major debate between advocates of the atomistic or separate-discipline approach and advocates of the holistic approach revolved around detailed presentations of the virtues of each system. Advocates of the atomistic approach argued that adopting a holistic approach might mean sacrificing depth for breadth, while in a lively rebuttal of that position, Professor Shlomo Shoham of Tel Aviv University, Israel, presented the simile of the criminologist as the conductor of an orchestra: the conductor need not be an expert in each individual instrument; he needs only the ability to supervise, direct and blend his musicians' individual talents.

Two other major points of concern were the content of the doctoral program and the relationship of the doctoral program and the operational field. The overall feeling about program content was that the doctoral level criminologist should be equipped with three packages of knowledge: an in-depth knowledge of criminal justice, competence in a social science discipline, and proficiency in tool courses such as statistics and computer science.

Regarding the relationship between education and operation, three possibilities for doctoral level education were cited: (1) that the Ph.D. (the academic research degree) produce professors and researchers for academia, (2) that the same Ph.D. is desirable for leadership positions in operational agencies, and (3) that a new, specialized professional doctorate must be devised for application to operational fields.

The climate within which this conference was held on this state university campus, when contrasted with some of the attitudes expressed at the time of the establishment of the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology on that same campus in 1969, is worthy of note as an indicator of the general change in the attitudes of academia toward criminal justice education. The report on the conference appeared as a cover

story of the Graduate School Chronicle, while seven to eight years ago, as the Director of the Institute reported in the monograph Introducing a Law Enforcement Curriculum at a State University, published by LEAA, the proposal to have such an Institute met on the floor of the University Senate and other faculty bodies with the comment on at least part of the faculty: "I don't want to see our undergraduate students mingle with policemen on the campus, or have police sergeants function as professors" and "Everybody knows what a policeman is like. It is ridiculous to call his work a profession; there are no scientific aspects to law enforcement at all; hence law enforcement does not have any place in an institution of higher learning." Criminal justice education has come a long way in the last eight years.

The proceedings of the conference are being published.

CONFERENCE ACTIVITY--NON-CONSORTIUM

The Institute and its Director have been involved in various types of international activities for a number of years. The provision for an International Component in the Consortium grant provided a further basis and stimulus for these activities, which by far transcended those carried on under the International Component funding. Although they cannot be credited directly to the Consortium project, it is felt that they should be included in this report briefly as a characterization of the Institute during the Consortium period. Besides, all Consortium universities were invariably informed about these

activities and attempts were made to involve them by inviting them to the conferences, etc. Both faculty and graduate students of the Institute were intensely involved in these activities, and one of the Ph.D. candidates was given a one-month international fellowship to Europe--all this for the purpose of broadening the scope and perspective of the graduate community of the Institute.

INTERNATIONAL SEMINARS AND TRAINING PROGRAMS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

In the fall of 1974 the Institute received an LEAA grant of \$350,000 for the above-mentioned International Seminars project, with the University of Montreal International Centre for Comparative Criminology sharing part of the funds as a subcontractor. The Director of the Institute functioned as the Project Director and Ms. Mary Jane Wood as Project Coordinator. The intensive planning activities and participation in a number of seminars and training programs organized by the subcontractor will not be covered here. For its part, however, the Institute convened a seminar on the topic of drug abuse.

INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON SOCIOCULTURAL FACTORS IN NONMEDICAL DRUG USE

This seminar was convened on the University of Maryland campus at the Center of Adult Education on November 3-5, 1975. It was attended by eight foreign participants and seven from the United States. A number of observers from the Institute faculty and the graduate student body also took part, and several graduate students were employed as recorders. Mr. Charles

Work, Deputy Administrator, and Mr. George H. Bohlinger, III, Project Monitor, represented LEAA. One of the American participants was Professor James Fox from Eastern Kentucky University a member of the Consortium, not to mention the Maryland Project Director. The report on the seminar was submitted to LEAA, and the proceedings are in the process of publication. The participants, several of whom are internationally known experts in the drug field, strongly felt that the seminar made a distinct contribution to the specific topic with which it dealt and suggested that it should be followed by another seminar on the role of social control in drug abuse.

MEETING ON CHANGES IN FORMS AND DIMENSIONS OF
CRIMINALITY--TRANSNATIONAL AND NATIONAL

On April 10-13, 1975, the Institute, in cooperation with the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Section of the United Nations, convened a meeting of a working group of experts on Agenda Item 1, "Changes in Forms and Dimensions of Criminality --Transnational and National" in preparation for the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders. The meeting was funded by a special LEAA grant to the Institute of \$25,000. Fourteen experts took part in the meeting, representing as many countries. Mr. Gerhard O. W. Mueller, Chief, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Section of the United Nations, headed the United Nations Staff, and a number of observers, including several members of the Institute faculty, also took part. A number of the Institute's graduate students were employed as recorders. The proceedings

of the meeting were published by the Institute as a monograph. The deliberations of the experts were reflected in the respective agenda item of the United Nations Congress in Geneva in September 1975.

CONFERENCE OF CONSORTIUM DIRECTORS IN PREPARATION OF U. S. NATIONAL PAPER FOR THE FIFTH UNITED NATIONS CONGRESS ON THE PREVENTION OF CRIME AND TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS

The Director of the Maryland Institute was charged with the task of preparing the U. S. National Paper for the United States Delegation to the Fifth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders. A special LEAA grant for this purpose was received to facilitate the preparation of the paper. Among the groups consulted and convened in the process were the Consortium Project Directors, who met in College Park on March 21, 1975, to discuss possible topics for inclusion and also prepared background statements for consideration in writing the paper. The role of the Consortium in the participation of the Project Directors was duly acknowledged in the paper, which was distributed at the Congress in Geneva to participating delegates in five languages. Subsequently, the English version was published as a monograph by the American Correctional Association.

RESEARCH--CONSORTIUM FUNDED

As a corollary to the strengthening of the Ph.D. program in criminal justice, the Consortium Agreement emphasized the need for research to be conducted by the Consortium universities. The key figure in the center of such research activities

was intended to be the Research Director whom each of the universities was expected to employ. Since the Consortium grant to the University of Maryland was made only toward the end of the fall semester of 1973, it was impossible to find a full-time Research Director for the balance of that academic year. Dr. Ray Tennyson, Associate Professor on the Institute Faculty, consented to take on this responsibility on a part-time basis. He continued in this capacity also in the fall semester of 1974, even though a full-time Research Director, Dr. Gerald R. Wheeler, was employed. Dr. Wheeler, however, left the University after the spring semester of 1975, and Dr. Richard Butler took his place and continued to the end of the Consortium grant.

All three Research Directors were available to the graduate students and the faculty as consultants on research designs, statistical methodology, and computer data processing. Each one also taught a tutorial-type course, in which the students established contact with the criminal justice agencies of the state and the region with a view to developing tentative research designs and proposals and, in some cases, actually engaging in research. A number of M.A. and Ph.D. candidates were helped in their thesis and dissertation research designs by the advice of the Research Director.

COLLEGE PARK CAMPUS VICTIMIZATION STUDY

In his capacity as Research Director, Dr. Richard Butler undertook a victimization study among students on the College Park campus of the University of Maryland in the spring semester

of 1976. With some funding from the research component of the Consortium grant, he engaged a group of graduate students in this project, which offered an excellent opportunity for training in research methodology, survey techniques, and computer analysis. A sample of 4000 students was taken. A preliminary and summary report of the study was presented as a paper at the American Congress of Correction in Denver in August 1976 under the sponsorship of the Research Council of the ACA. A more detailed analysis of the data required more time than expected, and the monograph could not be completed prior to the termination of the Consortium grant. It will be distributed as a report when completed. When compared with the police data on campus criminality, the preliminary findings appear to present very considerable differences and opportunities for penetrating analysis.

PREPARATION OF COLLEGE STUDENTS AS AGENTS OF CHANGE IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE ENTRY LEVEL POSITIONS

This project, under the above title, has been conducted by Dr. Knowlton Johnson of the Institute faculty ever since he came to the University in the fall of 1971. He received support from the Institute and also research grants from the Graduate School. In the later stages of the project, support in the form of release time and graduate research assistant help was provided under the Consortium grant. Dr. Johnson reported on his experimental project in criminal justice education in several meetings and conferences, invariably arousing considerable interest in his method. Several mimeographed reports of

his presentations are available. Presently the project is in the evaluation stage, and the final report should be forthcoming in the near future. Related to the above project is Dr. Johnson's grant from the Maryland State Planning Agency, Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, for his work in the Prince George's County Criminal Justice Evaluation Unit. This three-year grant is in its second year and, with its \$12,000 yearly funding, provides two graduate assistantships for the Institute.

OTHER TIME RELEASE AND ASSISTANT HELP FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS

Several faculty members received a limited amount of assistant help and some time release for a variety of research projects of smaller scope on the basis of the Consortium grant.

RESEARCH--NON-CONSORTIUM FUNDED

MINORITY PRISON COMMUNITY PROJECT

In the spring of 1974 the Institute received a National Institute of Mental Health research grant in the amount of \$180,000 for two years for the study of minority prison communities. Dr. Julius Debro and Dr. Ray Tennyson were engaged in this project as Director and Chief Investigator, respectively. A faculty research assistant, Mr. Paul Lee, and four graduate research assistants were funded on the basis of that project. It was completed in May of 1976, and the final report is in preparation.

THE MARYLAND CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAM AFTER
TERMINATION OF THE CONSORTIUM GRANT

At the time that the request for a proposal for a Consortium project was received, the administrators of the College Park campus of the University of Maryland met to discuss the action to be taken. The point was made that, if Maryland were to apply for the grant, it would have to be understood that after expansion of the graduate program of the Institute, with additional faculty employed and a larger number of doctoral students accepted, the University could not revert to the pre-Consortium funding of the Institute but would have to be prepared to take over, at least to a reasonable degree, responsibility for the students and faculty. No definite commitment was made, but it was understood that an effort would be made to live up to this obligation.

The three years following the establishment of the Consortium turned out to be a financially difficult period for higher education in the United States, with the University of Maryland no exception. Therefore it is especially gratifying that in spite of the financial constraints and the maintenance of most programs at a status quo, the University of Maryland found it possible to live up to its tentative commitment. With the expiration of the Consortium grant, five additional faculty lines were assigned to the Institute within the state budget, and five graduate assistantships, likewise state funded, were added to the previous contingent of assistants. In addition, the University provided, on a temporary basis, funding for

instructors for four courses in the fall semester of 1976.

The only drawback was in terms of secretarial help, the Institute losing both Consortium-funded secretaries. In spite of their efforts, the University administration at this time could not secure additional secretarial lines for state classified employees, which represents a real problem.

It should be noted that work is in progress on remodeling a building in which the Institute is scheduled to be placed--much larger and more appropriately designed quarters, which will provide not only larger office space for the faculty, graduate assistants, fellows, and the secretariat, but also a laboratory, lounges for graduate and undergraduate students, a criminal justice library, and a conference and seminar room. In spite of the fact that the present quarters of the Institute are very modern and are looked upon very favorably by visitors, the increase in space will solve many problems. The new building is supposed to be ready some time after the fall of 1977.

It is quite obvious that the University's living up to expectations as far as program support is concerned was predicated by the actual expansion of the Institute's program and especially the graduate program as the result of the three years of Consortium funding. The table below presents perhaps most objectively and vividly the development of the program from the fall semester of 1973, at the end of which the Consortium grant was awarded, to the fall semester of 1976, the first semester without Consortium funding except for the seven graduate fellowships.

Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology

September 1976

	Fall 1973 Funded Items State Budget	Fall 1976 Funded Items State Budget
Total Teaching Faculty	8 lines	13 lines and funds for 1-1/3 FTE
Graduate Assistantships	7	12 Institute 3 Other campus sources
Undergraduate Majors	332	650 (spring 1976)
M.A. Candidates	38	53
Ph.D. Candidates	0	24
Ph.D. Research Fellow- ships	0	7 LEAA fellowships 1 Graduate School fellowship
No. of Graduate Courses in Catalog	15	24
No. of Courses and Sections Taught	23	36
Total No. of Students Enrolled in Insti- tute Courses	1495	2900+
Secretaries	2	2 (plus 1 faculty research asst. for graduate program)

If asked what are the major problems facing the Institute and especially its graduate program after termination of Consortium funding, the answer must be that the major issue is going to be financial support to graduate students, especially the Ph.D. students. Experience with admissions has shown that only very few applicants do not request and actually need some

kind of financial support. The inability to provide such aid usually means loss of the applicant. This is especially true with regard to the competitively better qualified applicants, who usually can locate another university that can find some way to give them the needed financial assistance.

The need for financial assistance is especially cogent in the case of minority students, most of whom cannot continue studies on the graduate level unless they receive substantial support. At the same time, in view of the current interest of American institutions of higher learning to attract minority students, again, those minority applicants who are better qualified usually have no difficulty in finding some university which is ready and able to help.

The Institute feels that, with the beginning of the 1976-7 academic year, it has a very strong group of doctoral students, most of whom are sure to make a substantial contribution to the criminal justice field. Without a continued and increased number of fellowships and a much larger number of graduate teaching and research assistantships, it is clearly impossible to further improve or even maintain present standards of quality.

Another major problem consists in the need for additional faculty. The fact that the University took over the funding of the faculty lines provided by the Consortium does not mean that the optimum level of staffing has been reached. In a state university, which depends on student tuitions for its operations, a certain proportion must be maintained between the undergraduate program and the graduate program which an academic unit can

support. Thus, to remain viable, in offering a high quality graduate program the Institute must satisfy the needs also of an undergraduate program. This is, of course, also a direct objective of the Institute and not only a necessary prerequisite for the graduate program. The Institute views its over 600 full-time undergraduate majors as a major contribution to the State of Maryland and the nation. But in order to maintain a graduate program of excellence, the graduate faculty must be freed from teaching too many hours of introductory courses in order to have the necessary time for seminars, advising, and the supervision of research--not to speak of doing research of their own. In order to be able to function even on approximately the same level as at the present time, the Institute needs several additional faculty members.

The above are the challenges for the future. In the meantime there is no denying that great strides have been made and that the Institute can view with true satisfaction its accomplishments to date with the aid of the Consortium grant.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA
PROGRAM HISTORY

By
Samuel Walker
Vincent J. Webb

The story of the development of a graduate program in criminal justice at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, and the impact of the 406(e) Educational Development Grant upon that program, can be divided into four parts. The first deals with the origins and development of the undergraduate program at the old Omaha University. The second deals with the initial planning for a graduate program and application for federal grant monies. The third deals with the awarding of the 406(e) grant and the launching of the graduate program in the fall of 1974. The fourth is a description of that program. The story is complicated by a series of administrative changes and conflicts within the University which had a direct impact on the development of the Criminal Justice Department.

I. CRIMINAL JUSTICE AT UNO: BEGINNINGS

In the beginning there was neither a department of criminal justice nor even a University of Nebraska at Omaha. The first steps toward a criminal justice-related program were taken in 1962 in the Sociology Department of the old Omaha University. The University was then a wholly municipally supported institution. It merged into the University of Nebraska system in 1968 when it became the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO).

In 1962 the Sociology Department inaugurated a law enforcement program consisting of three courses. A large part of the impetus for the program came from the public safety director of the city of Omaha, a man whose experience in California had made him conscious of the relevance of higher education for law enforcement personnel. This initial program was supported financially by elements of the community rather than by the University.

The program continued and expanded during the academic year of 1963-64. In 1965 the program moved out of the Sociology Department and was placed under the College of Continuing Studies (CCS). That year the program accepted its first students majoring in Law Enforcement and Security. The Community Relations Director of the Omaha Police Department was the first graduate of the program. Throughout this period, the program was staffed primarily with part-time instructors who were funded with University hard-money lines.

The advent of federal monies in 1963 helped to bring about a significant expansion of the law enforcement program at Omaha University. In 1963 the University received a grant of \$20,000 from the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance to support "program development." Funds from the State of Nebraska, through the Higher Education Act of 1965, also assisted the program at this time. These funds provided mainly short courses for police officers and a training program for volunteer firemen throughout the state.

In 1969 the program achieved full departmental status, emerging as the Department of Law Enforcement and Corrections (LEC), remaining within the College of Continuing Studies. Professor Gaylon Kuchel, who had been directing the program previously and who had been the prime moving force behind its development, became department chairman. Two additional full-time faculty members were added at this time to supplement the part-time faculty.

The first steps toward the launching of a program in criminal justice at the Lincoln campus of the University of Nebraska were also taken in 1969 (Omaha University having been merged with the Nebraska system the previous year). Here again, the initiative lay with local criminal justice agencies. The Lincoln Police Department made the initial inquiries about a program to the Omaha law enforcement program. However, tentative proposals for a Lincoln-based program met with some resistance from various academic units on the Lincoln campus. Finally, the

Dean of the Nebraska Law School agreed to have courses taught in his facility. At the beginning of each semester UNO dispatched a registrar and a cashier to the Lincoln Police Department to enroll students and collect tuition. This arrangement accounts, in part, for the present situation whereby the criminal justice program is offered on both the Omaha and the Lincoln campuses but is administered solely through the Omaha campus.

After two years under this initial arrangement, students on the Lincoln campus asked for a full academic program open to regular University students. Once again, federal monies were instrumental in launching this additional program. A grant from the Nebraska State Crime Commission provided for two full-time faculty positions for the academic year 1970-1971. This grant was renewed and enlarged to include a third full-time faculty position on the Lincoln campus. However, the grant only carried the program through the early spring of 1972. A financial crisis then arose as the University had to absorb an ongoing program in the middle of an academic year. This crisis coincided with an important administrative reorganization on the UNO campus which was to have significant ramifications for the Criminal Justice Department.

II. THE ADVENT OF THE 406(e) GRANT

The 406(e) Educational Development Grant appeared in the midst of a considerable administrative reorganization throughout the University of Nebraska system. The merger of the old Omaha University with existing state institutions had led to the creation of a "systems-level" administration to coordinate the three campuses (the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, and the University of Nebraska Medical Center at Omaha). One important consequence of this development was that graduate programs on the Omaha campus--and the related questions of faculty recruitment and retention policies--fell under the scrutiny of the Lincoln-based systems office. Ultimately, this led to a raising of academic criteria (especially for faculty) on the Omaha campus which did not have, and still does not have, a doctoral level program in operation.

Even more significant for the Criminal Justice Department was the development of a new college on the Omaha campus in 1972, the College of Public Affairs and Community Service (CPACS). As the name of the College indicates, it was designed to house programs with an urban social service orientation. Eventually it included the Departments of Urban Studies, Social Work, Public Administration, and Criminal Justice, and a number of other nondepartmental programs. Professor Hubert G. Locke assumed the position of dean on July 1, 1972, and the College commenced operations in the academic year 1972-73.

A certain amount of friction accompanied this development. The Chairman of the Criminal Justice Department felt that the Department had not been consulted, as promised, with respect to its transfer from the College of Continuing Studies. Meanwhile, the Dean of the new College was concerned about the practice of using grant monies to launch expanded programs which the University was later forced to absorb. (The University had just endured the financial crisis brought on by the expiration of the State Crime Commission grant in the spring of 1972.)

These underlying tensions, accompanied by differing philosophies about the nature of criminal justice education which became more apparent as time went on, led to a major clash between the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Department and the Dean of the College. This clash, in turn, led to the firing of the Chairman in the summer of 1974 with considerable impact on the development of the graduate program.

Consideration of an expanded criminal justice program and an eventual graduate program had begun as early as 1970 with conversations between Mr. Kuchel, Chairman of the Department, and Mr. William Utley, Dean of the College of Continuing Studies. In the fall of 1971 the Department submitted an application to LEAA requesting a small planning grant. A revised application requesting a substantially larger amount of money was submitted in 1972. These applications were in response to the original Centers of Excellence concept proposed by LEAA. An understanding was reached between Chairman Kuchel and the

newly appointed Dean Locke that the University would work toward the eventual development of a graduate program in criminal justice, with or without federal financial assistance. Informally, it was understood that the target date for such a program was January 1975 at the earliest--or, more likely, August 1976. At no time was a doctoral program in criminal justice either proposed or seriously considered.

The Centers of Excellence proposal, as far as UNO was concerned, languished throughout much of the academic year 1972-73 while LEAA reevaluated and reconsidered its own priorities. At a meeting in Washington in February 1973, Mr. Kuchel and Norval Jespersen of LEAA discussed, in very general terms, a concept that eventually became embodied in the Consortium. However, little else developed with regard to the program until June 1973.

In early June 1973, Mr. Kuchel was notified by Mr. Jespersen that UNO had been designated as a possible recipient of a major grant. Mr. Kuchel indicated that the University was definitely interested, and Mr. Jespersen replied that a site visit by Carl Hamm would take place in Omaha in a few days. Arrangements for the site visit were hastily made--so hastily, in fact, that Dean Locke had to be called back from a College staff retreat in Colorado.

Conversations at the site visit in Omaha on June 7, 1973, involved Carl Hamm and Norval Jespersen from LEAA and Chairman Kuchel, Dean Locke, Dean William Gaines (outgoing Vice President for Academic Affairs), and Chancellor Ronald Roskens, from

the University. The nature of the grant was discussed in considerable detail. The UNO people emphasized the point that, given the resources of the University and the time frame required to launch a doctoral program, UNO could commit itself only to an exploration of the possibility of a doctoral program. There were no doctoral programs operating on the UNO campus at that time, and UNO officials were acutely conscious of the limited resources of the University, especially in terms of library facilities and graduate level faculty, when the idea of a doctoral program in criminal justice was introduced by the LEAA representatives. (In 1974 a doctoral program in psychology began, although it is officially administered through the Psychology Department of the Lincoln campus. However, it should be noted that this limited psychology doctoral program at UNO is immeasurably strengthened by a number of joint faculty appointments with the University of Nebraska Medical Center, also located in Omaha.) The reservations of the UNO representatives were incorporated in a footnote to the grant which specified that "In this endeavor UNO will explore singly and in conjunction with other interested institutions the establishment of terminal degree programs related to criminal justice. Commitment as to locus, substance, and timing of these programs must await necessary consultations, research and development, and appropriation of suitable resources."

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GRADUATE PROGRAM

The 406(e) grant became effective for UNO on July 1, 1973, even though the formal signing did not occur until November 1973. The haste with which the grant was implemented caused some embarrassment for UNO officials in relation to the Board of Regents. News items about a doctoral program in criminal justice appeared in the local press before the Board of Regents had formally accepted the grant.

In the minds of UNO personnel, the 1973-1974 academic year was one of normal start-up, prior to the implementation of the master's degree program in the fall of 1974. Through a series of meetings in late 1973 and early 1974, UNO officials repeated their point that the University was prepared only to consider the possibility of a doctoral program.

As the graduate program proposal moved through the UNO administrative channels in late 1973 and early 1974, Dr. Vincent J. Webb was hired as Research Director. He assumed that position in December 1973, this step was seen as a normal preparatory move prior to the beginning of the master's degree program the next fall.

The advent of the 406(e) grant coincided with the start of Phase II of the Omaha Pilot Cities project, another LEAA-funded program operated through the University. Controversy over the Pilot Cities program eventually precipitated a major conflict between Dean Locke and Chairman Kuchel. The Pilot Cities program had begun operations in the fall of 1972. Phase I

ended with an extremely critical evaluation by LEAA and a re-organization of the project. Dean Locke, on behalf of the University, moved to assert a more direct role in administering the program, bringing in Dr. William Arkin to run the program. Dr. Arkin's administration ultimately became the focal point of a major controversy over the program.

In March 1974 conflict between Mr. Kuchel and Dean Locke reached a head and broke into the local press. In a lengthy report submitted to the UNO administration, Mr. Kuchel charged Dean Locke with mismanagement of the Pilot Cities program, including allegations of conflict of interest involving a private institute operated by the Dean. Although this conflict concerned the Pilot Cities program and not the Criminal Justice Department itself, it had a direct impact on the developing graduate program. This was inescapable, given the various roles occupied by the principal figures involved in the controversy. Quite obviously, communication between the Chairman and the Dean broke down.

The immediate conflict was resolved in June 1974 when Dean Locke fired Mr. Kuchel as Chairman of the Department. The Dean then appointed Professors James C. Kane and Fred Holbert (representing the Omaha and Lincoln campuses, respectively) as co-Vice Chairmen. Mr. Kuchel was also removed as Project Director of the 406(e) grant and was replaced by Dr. Vincent J. Webb. In September, a search committee was formed to secure a permanent chairman for the Department.

Perhaps the most serious consequence of this conflict on the graduate program was its effect on faculty recruitment. The period from March through June would have been the normal time for securing a full graduate-level faculty for the new program. However, while the controversy continued, the UNO Provost instituted a freeze on hiring by the Department. Meanwhile, the energies of key individuals were almost completely absorbed by the Pilot Cities conflict. The removal of Mr. Kuchel and the appointment of Professors Kane, Holbert, and Webb to their respective positions occurred barely two months before the master's degree program was to begin.

As of mid-July 1974, the graduate faculty situation was extremely critical. At that time, the entire faculty on the Omaha campus consisted of Professors Webb, Kuchel, Kane, and Dawson. Only Professor Webb held a Ph.D. degree and was able to meet the requirements of the Graduate College. Dr. William Smith and Dr. Martin Klein were appointed at the last minute as additional graduate faculty. Dr. Smith holds a doctorate in sociology from the University of California at Berkeley, Dr. Klein came to UNO as a visiting scholar from the University of Hamburg, West Germany, with degrees in law and sociology. These three individuals, Drs. Webb, Smith, and Klein, comprised the graduate faculty at the beginning of the fall semester in August 1974.

The Criminal Justice Department also added Ms. Gillian Romuld in the summer of 1974. A lawyer, Ms. Romuld was originally recruited to help develop the international component of the Consortium agreement. Her area of interest was largely in comparative international law. It was hoped that she would also be able to teach on the graduate level, but a ruling from the Graduate College to the effect that she did not possess a terminal degree precluded that possibility. Some question as to the status of the J.D. degree remains, with important implications for future faculty recruitment. In late August 1974, Dr. Samuel Walker was hired as a Research Associate. Dr. Walker assumed the position of Research Director (replacing Dr. Webb) in October and began teaching on the graduate level in the second semester.

The question of future faculty recruitment, and the development of the graduate program, became further clouded by the worsening economic situation in both the state and the nation. For example, state revenues were affected by the drought that occurred in the summer of 1974. It became clear that the University would receive no new hard-line positions in the foreseeable future. Indeed, there was even talk of contingency plans for dropping existing faculty positions should the economic situation worsen still further. The implications of this for the future of the graduate program were considerable since all existing graduate level faculty were on soft-money lines.

The master's degree program began in August 1974 with approximately 42 students enrolled. Interest in the program seemed extremely high, especially in light of the delays that occurred in announcing the program (delays that were also a result of the Pilot Cities dispute). The number of students enrolled increased to approximately 60 with the start of the second semester.

The lack of a permanent department chairperson during the 1974-75 academic year resulted in considerable faculty uncertainty about the future of the Department. The new structure of two vice-chairmen and a grant project director produced substantial confusion. It was not altogether clear where areas of decision making were located.

In September 1974 the Dean initiated a search for a new chairperson. A seven-member search committee was organized consisting of the two Vice-Chairmen of the Department of Criminal Justice, the Associate Dean of the College of Public Affairs and Community Service, two members of the liberal arts faculty, and two representatives from the community--both lawyers with a long record of involvement in the University and in criminal justice-related affairs. Between September and January, sentiment developed among a number of faculty members that the Department was not playing a sufficient role in the search process. Three factors gave rise to this sentiment. First, it was felt that the graduate faculty was not represented. Also, it appeared that the search committee would make its

recommendations to the College and not to the Department. Second, the members of the Department were only beginning to develop a sense of collegiality and a system of governance. No departmental committee structure had previously existed until one was created in late fall 1974. At the same time a low-level debate began to develop regarding the role of a chairperson. Debate over this and other issues delayed the search process considerably. A third factor was concern over the fiscal stability of the new graduate program. It was argued by some that the use of hard-line monies for a chairperson hired from outside the University would hamper the transfer of existing graduate faculty from soft to hard money.

As a result of these various factors, the faculty recommended to the Dean that he consider appointing a chairperson from within the existing faculty. The Dean indicated that he was not opposed to an inside candidate, but stipulated that a national search be conducted in order to secure the best possible candidate. The search process was further delayed by disagreement over the nominees originally forwarded to the Dean in late March. A new evaluation of candidates was then undertaken, and the selection of a chairperson was still unresolved by late May 1975. The delay in selecting a permanent chairperson added to existing uncertainties about the future of the Department and the graduate program.

Soon after the original Research Director had been hired, attempts had been made to establish a research program that would provide a rational basis for program development and curriculum revision. Former graduates of the UNO undergraduate criminal justice program were surveyed to ascertain their views on the relevance of their educational experience. A new emphasis was also placed on the development of substantive research projects on the part of existing faculty and staff. This was partly dictated by the need to develop graduate level faculty with a record of scholarly publications. The Department undertook a program of publishing "in-house" research reports as a way of encouraging and supporting faculty research.

In addition, joint research projects with other departments in the University were established. The most notable projects were in conjunction with the Departments of Psychology, Social Work, Public Administration, and Philosophy. Interdepartmental research projects were also undertaken with a view toward developing an interdisciplinary faculty for the graduate program. There was a general consensus in the Department and the University that the future of the graduate program lay with an interdisciplinary approach. This was dictated both by philosophical considerations and a realistic assessment of the availability of resources.

Another major research effort was the assessment of manpower needs in criminal justice higher education. All academic institutions in LEAA Regions VII and VIII were surveyed to

determine the need for individuals with graduate degrees in criminal justice. This effort was undertaken in conjunction with the Consortium-wide effort to assess manpower needs. Research projects in the areas of juvenile delinquency, police history, American Indian justice, and the social psychological dimensions of dangerousness were also undertaken. Thus, a major accomplishment made possible by the 406(e) funding was the establishment of a research atmosphere which led to the production of much substantial research which, in turn, made graduate faculty development possible.

Another major accomplishment that resulted from the 406(e) grant was the master's program in criminal justice described in the following section.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE GRADUATE PROGRAM

A. MASTER OF ARTS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The M.A. degree program in criminal justice consists of a core of required courses in criminal justice combined with related course work outside the Department. The Department offers both a law enforcement and a corrections concentration within the M.A. program.

1. Law Enforcement Concentration

a. Required Core Courses 6 hours

801v Criminal Justice Planning and Innovation

802v Seminar in the Administration of Justice

b. Related Core Courses 6 hours
(student selects two with advisor approval)

803v Comparative Law Enforcement Systems

805v Seminar in Criminal Jurisprudence

803v Seminar in the Processes of the Criminal
Justice System

810v Seminar in Crime Prevention

813v Contemporary Criminalistics

814v Independent Study

c. Cognate Courses 12 hours

The student will select, with advisor approval, six hours of course work from each of two areas. These areas may include, but are not limited to, sociology, political science, psychology, social work, etc.

- d. Completion of an Approved Thesis 6 hours
 - e. Successful Oral Defense of the Thesis
2. Corrections Concentration
- a. Required Core Courses 6 hours
 - 801v Criminal Justice Planning and Innovation
 - 802v Seminar in the Administration of Justice
 - b. Related Core Courses 6 hours
 - 804v Seminar in Community Services and Treatment
 - 805v Seminar in Criminal Jurisprudence
 - 806v Seminar in Institutional Resocialization
 - 807v Theoretical Criminology
 - 809v Special Problems in Criminal Justice
 - 814v Independent Study
 - c. Cognate Courses 12 hours

The student will select, with advisor approval, six hours of course work from each of two areas. These areas may include, but are not limited to, sociology, political science, psychology, social work, etc.
 - d. Completion of an Approved Thesis 6 hours
 - e. Successful Oral Defense of the Thesis

B. MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The M.S. degree program in criminal justice consists of 36 hours of course work, including a core of required courses in criminal justice and related course work outside the Department. The Department offers both a law enforcement and a corrections concentration within the M.S. degree program.

1. Law Enforcement Concentration

a. Required Core Courses 12 hours

801v Criminal Justice Planning and Innovation

802v Seminar in the Administration of Justice

810v Seminar in Crime Prevention

812v Criminal Justice Research Theory and Methodology

b. Related Core Courses 9 hours

803v Comparative Law Enforcement Systems

805v Seminar in Criminal Jurisprudence

808v Seminar in the Processes of the Criminal Justice System

811v Special Problems in Criminal Justice

813v Contemporary Criminalistics

814v Independent Study

c. Cognate Courses 15 hours

Courses selected with advisor approval from related fields, including but not limited to sociology, political science, psychology, social work, etc.

d. Satisfactory Completion of a Comprehensive Examination

2. Corrections Concentration

a. Required Core Courses 12 hours

801v Criminal Justice Planning and Innovation

802v Seminar in the Administration of Justice

807v Theoretical Criminology

812v Criminal Justice Research Theory and Methodology

b. Related Core Courses 9 hours

804v Seminar in Community Services and Treatment

806v Seminar in Institutional Resocialization

808v Seminar in the Processes of the Criminal Justice System

809v Seminar in Delinquency Prevention, Control, and Correction

811v Special Problems in Criminal Justice

814v Independent Study

c. Cognate Courses 15 hours

Courses selected with advisor approval from related fields, including but not limited to, sociology, political science, psychology, social work, etc.

d. Satisfactory Completion of a Comprehensive Examination

C. DOCTORAL PROGRAM PROPOSAL

Consistent with UNO's grant application, 406(e) funding also enabled UNO to explore the possibility of offering doctoral level work in criminal justice. A serious difference in opinion developed between LEAA and UNO over the meaning and intent of the UNO grant objectives. UNO officials saw their commitment as one of exploration, while LEAA viewed the commitment as requiring a doctoral program in place at the end of the grant. After much negotiation, UNO developed a more specific framework for exploring the possibility of a doctorate. This framework consisted of three alternatives:

1. a criminal justice concentration within existent Ph.D. programs;
2. a criminal justice concentration within the framework of an interdisciplinary Ph.D.;
3. a criminal justice concentration within a newly proposed D.A.S. (Doctorate in Administrative Science) program.

Utilizing Dr. George Felkenes as a curriculum consultant, a formal proposal for a doctoral level criminal justice program was under preparation during the last semester of the grant. Target dates included May 1, 1976, as the deadline for submitting the proposal to the Graduate Dean; October 1976 as the date for final program approval, and January 1977 as the date for initiating doctoral level course work.



END