NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM

VOLUME II

ANALYSIS OF CONSORTIUM ENDEAVOR

MEMBER SCHOOLS:

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

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 II

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONSORTIUM ENDEAVOR

By

Gilbert H. Bruns
Carolyn O'Hearn

1976

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.

PREFACE

This volume is the second 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. ORIGINS OF THE NCJEC

HISTORY OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION*

The LEAA 406(e) grants for developing or strengthening graduate level education in criminal justice came at a significant time and in response to a need felt in both educational and operational circles in criminal justice. In order to appreciate the meaning of the grants and the functions which they performed during the three years of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium, one has to understand the circumstances under which the formulation of the Consortium occurred.

Until very recently, one of the major characteristics of criminal justice as compared to other specialized activities in modern society was the absence of a specially designed educational system. Such an educational system is established for the basic purpose of preparing personnel; at the same time, it

*Material on the history of criminal justice education was written by Peter P. Lejins, Project Director at the University of Maryland, with suggestions from other members of the NCJEC Board of Directors.

serves as a receptacle for accumulated knowledge and experience and provides a base for research. These specialized educational systems usually underpin the formation of a profession or occupational group which staffs a particular activity.

Medical care in modern society has its own educational system--the schools of medicine, which produce the needed specialists and are essential for the existence of the medical profession. The legal profession has its law schools or--outside of the Anglo-Saxon common-law countries--faculties of law. In the United States, economists are prepared in departments of economics, modern architects depend on the schools of architecture, chemists on departments of chemistry, and so on ad infinitum in our modern, extremely specialized and diversified society. The national task of handling the crime problem involves personnel numerically equal, and in many cases far surpassing, many other specialized professions and occupational groups--all of which rely on educational facilities specially tailored for them. However, until just a few years ago, no similar educational system existed for criminal justice personnel. And even now, after a decade of effort to create such a system, there are many in academic and professional circles who would deny criminal justice such a specialized educational system of its own.

Prior to 1965, when the need for doing something major about the crime problem surfaced nationally, educational preparation for what is now called criminal justice was highly fragmented. The three major academic sources for criminal justice personnel were the law schools, the departments of sociology, and the schools of social work. Each of these has deficiencies as educational programs for criminal justice.

Law schools teach criminal law and criminal procedure, although there is not much opportunity for a law student to specialize in criminal law while in law school or preparing for the bar examination. However, the law school does provide the legal profession with a knowledge of criminal law basic to the legislative process in that area; the implementation of criminal law by the police, the courts, the prosecution and defense; as well as the management of the convicted offender. Judges, defense attorneys, and prosecutors have a general education in law but are not specifically educated to handle criminal matters. They function as generalists who from time to time are assigned to the handling of criminal cases or who gradually become specialists through experience. Although the law school teaches criminal law and procedure, there is no study of criminology or of the criminal offender, the reasons for his becoming a criminal, or the ways of prevention or correction. Thus, when graduates of law schools and members of the bar are called upon to serve in positions which deal with correctional or preventive matters, as commissioners of correction, directors of prison systems, wardens or superintendents of institutions, they do not do so on the basis of any real educational qualifications, because, though they have studied law, only rarely have they studied the social or behavioral sciences in any depth.

The behavioral and social science studies of criminality and the criminal constitute a second educational track in the area of the crime problem. This is what is generally referred to as criminology. In the United States for the last three-quarters of a century departments of sociology have been the major home of criminological studies. One has to stress the experience of the United States in this case, because in other countries sociology was practically unknown as a separate academic unit until after World War II. Even now, in 1976, there are few departments of sociology outside of the United States. Thus criminology abroad is not housed in departments of sociology, but studies and research are carried on primarily in departments of psychology, in the faculties of medicine as part of psychiatry and forensic medicine, in departments of anthropology, and perhaps above all in the faculties of law, which, being of a much more general educational nature than the American professional law school, have developed their own institutes of criminology.

The departments of sociology in the United States have been responsible for the development of the study of criminology to a degree unsurpassed anywhere in the world. But these programs in no way constitute a regular educational channel for the preparation of workers for the field of criminal justice. If a person graduates from a department of sociology with a specialization in criminology, there is no direct link for that individual to enter an operational agency in the criminal justice field. He is a teacher and researcher--a sociologist who has in that capacity studied the phenomenon of crime. His chances of entering the operational field of criminal justice are no greater than those of the graduates of many other disciplines, such as public administration, certain types of psychology, or political science. Thus, while sociology departments have produced an unprecedented amount of new knowledge on the subject of crime, as well as some teaching and research personnel, by no means can they be considered as programs for the education of professionals in criminal justice.

The schools of social work represent the third type of educational programs partially linked to criminal justice. These schools produce professional personnel for helping people who cannot cope by themselves with the problems of modern society but who need help through case work, group work, or community organization by specially educated professionals. Criminals and juvenile delinquents are also persons with problems, and the profession of social work has laid its claim to serving the offenders--especially as probation officers, parole officers, counselors in institutional settings, and high delinquency area community organizers. At the same time the schools of social work have maintained the general policy of generic education for social work rather than specialized education for helping offender populations. With very few exceptions, little emphasis on the systematic study of the criminal offender has ever been practiced by the schools of social work.

In addition to the above three major educational programs, many other educational programs have occasionally produced personnel for criminal justice. There are many psychologists, psychiatrists, administrators, management specialists, and educators who hold positions in criminal justice operational agencies. But they have received their preparation in educational programs especially designed for the particular discipline from which they have come, and not specifically for criminal justice. One might refer to this development as the "colonization" of criminal justice by a variety of professions. The term "colonization" is meant to indicate that the study of criminal justice and the preparation of its personnel are not the primary objectives of sociology, psychology, or social work. These disciplines do not address themselves primarily to the problem of crime and are not basically concerned with how best to deal with the crime problem in its totality. They contribute some of the personnel who may handle certain aspects of the problem in accordance with the premises of a given discipline. Those individuals find employment, income, and perhaps some research opportunities in the field of crime control and prevention, but generally remain guided by the interests of their own discipline. Of course, the contributions of the representatives of these and other disciplines have benefited criminal justice; however, personnel are also needed who have a primary interest in and loyalty to criminal justice itself and not to some other discipline--individuals with specific criminal justice knowledge who have a vested interest in crime control and prevention and who feel a direct responsibility for its successes or failures.

It should be noted that even before the middle sixties there were some academic programs in the United States which educated their students primarily and directly in what we now refer to as criminal justice. The foremost example was the School of Criminology at the University of California, Berkeley. This school gradually developed four tracks: etiology of criminal behavior, corrections, police science, and criminalistics, thus fairly well covering the entire field of criminal justice. There were a few police science curricula, and some of the programs in criminology in the departments of sociology developed into reasonably independent units that gave sufficient emphasis to criminology and corrections to differentiate them from the general sociological program. However, these early beginnings, significant as they were, were so few in number that they could hardly be considered as a substantial preparatory educational system for the field as a whole.

It was only at the end of the sixties that the need for specialized educational programs preparing criminal justice personnel crystallized and was forcefully put forward and provided with initial financial support. The federal government was a leader in this movement, specifically, of course, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice as established by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

Thus an entirely new era in criminal justice education began in the late sixties. Two major factors were the formulation of the new concept of "criminal justice," encompassing all of the activities pertaining to the phenomenon of crime, and the availability of federal funding for the development, maintenance, and strengthening of educational programs in criminal justice. The LEEP funding for students in criminal justice, reaching a high point in the vicinity of $40,000,000 per year, was a major vehicle for implementing new policies. State and local funding as well as private funding followed suit after the general trend crystallized. In response to this national movement, universities and colleges rapidly lost their skepticism about higher education in criminal justice and followed through with the development of new programs and appropriate academic units. The LEEP funding, of course, was not the only support provided by LEAA to criminal justice education. There were many other smaller-scale grants directed to the same end.

The vast and rapid educational expansion in criminal justice higher education placed a heavy strain on its resources. Competent teaching and research personnel were simply not available in the numbers suddenly required to staff all the new programs, and many standards and traditional quality controls had to be sacrificed. However, after this expansion was accomplished, it became obvious that the time had come to give attention to the improvement of quality.

It is at this point in the development of criminal justice education that LEAA made grants to seven universities for the purpose of developing or strengthening graduate programs in criminal justice in order to provide the needed planners, evaluators, teachers, and researchers. Those seven universities formed the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium.

CONSORTIA AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Although the idea of a consortium was new to criminal justice education, the concept itself is centuries old. Basically, a consortium is a union of two or more parties for the purpose of accomplishing in concert what would have been impossible or difficult to achieve alone. In the original Latin, the referent union was conjugal; however, a broader application has generally been common in English, and references to consortia in law and business occur in the language as early as the 1880's, according to the Oxford English Dictionary.

Only in the last 40 years have consortia been employed in higher education. The first recorded "college consortium" is that of the Claremont Colleges, which was established in 1925 and continues today. Although this association has been successful since its inception, the idea did not immediately take hold in the academic community, and during the next 30 years only a few scattered associations were established. Not until the early 1960's did consortia begin to enjoy some degree of popularity in academia. Since 1965, they have become increasingly prevalent in higher education.

Although consortia have certainly proliferated in the past decade, the extent of that proliferation is somewhat difficult to measure, primarily because of the difficulty of establishing a precise set of criteria by which to define a consortium. If all agreements--formal and informal, voluntary and statutory--were included, the number would nearly equal the total number of American colleges and universities. One study conducted several years ago indicated there were 1,296 consortia involving more than 1,500 institutions (U. S. Office of Education Report, 1965-1966), and there is no reason to believe that the numbers have diminished since that time.

In 1967, Lewis D. Patterson, then Director of Program Development for the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, established some criteria by which the better established and organized consortia could be identified. The criteria adopted were that each consortium:

1. Is a voluntary formal organization
2. Has three or more member institutions
3. Has multiacademic programs
4. Is administered by at least one full-time professional
5. Has a required annual contribution or other tangible evidence of long-term commitment of member institutions.

According to Patterson's 1973 Consortium Directory, 80 consortia fulfilled these criteria at that time (p. v).

The reasons for the consorting of educational institutions are as varied and multiple as the number of agreements which exist. However, certain themes are common to most agreements and can be identified as "general purposes" or objectives for establishment of a consortium relationship (Patterson, 1971, p. 20):

1. To improve the quality of educational programs and institutional operations
2. To expand educational opportunities
3. To facilitate change

4. To relate the institutions more effectively to their communities

5. To achieve economies

6. To raise funds.

Programs of consortia also fall into several general categories. Depending upon objectives, size, geographic location, and financial support, a consortium may be involved in one of several different programs. Among the most common types are:

1. Cross-registration of students

2. Exchange of faculty

3. Sharing of facilities (i.e., library, auditoriums, audiovisual materials, laboratories, computers)

4. Joint purchasing of equipment or acquisition of resource materials

5. Development of field service, overseas programs, and urban centers

6. Joint sponsorship of community programs to help the disadvantaged or assist community organizations in presenting special events or services

7. Lobbying for legislation favorable to the educational community

8. Joint student recruitment

9. Cooperative degree programs.

Most common among these programs are the sharing of facilities, cross-registration of students, and exchange of faculty.

It is not difficult to postulate reasons for the increasing prevalence of consortia in higher education during recent years, particularly the past decade. Institutions of higher education, particularly universities, are supposed to exist on the frontiers of knowledge--an area which becomes increasingly expensive. Libraries must have sophisticated information retrieval systems, the sciences must have laboratories, the business school must have computers. Modern technology offers breathtaking opportunities and challenges to higher education--but at equally breathtaking costs.

The obvious answer is cooperation. If several universities can use the same facilities, then costs can be cut drastically with no lowering of quality--in fact probably with an increase of quality. In somewhat different ways, the principle applies to exchange of faculty and students and other joint activities.

Membership in a consortium can also facilitate the acquiring of funds, as well as providing maximum utilization of existing funds. With its potential for effect upon many institutions and the increased resources in faculties and facilities, a consortium may develop proposals too formidable for a single institution to attempt. Private foundations and government agencies are particularly attracted to the idea of affecting many campuses through one granting of funds. Being a member of a consortium may also make it easier for a university entity--such as a department, center, or school--to maintain and perhaps increase its share of university funds.

Money, then--the lack of it and the consequent need by an institution to acquire more and to use more efficiently what it has--is probably the magnetic factor that draws most consortia together. The consortium appears to be the universal panacea for the problems of higher education--maximum quality and minimum cost.

Nevertheless, although the idea of consortia may be attractive and consequently productive of funds from foundations, government, and school, the actual achievement of solid results may be quite difficult. If money draws a consortium together, the preservation of institutional autonomy may well drive it apart or slow its progress incredibly. Scholars and institutions rightly insist upon the importance of academic freedom and jealously guard their independence. Proposals must wind their way through a labyrinth of committees at various levels. Sometimes, accomplishment is incredibly consuming of the time and energy of the individuals involved. When this process is multiplied in several institutions, progress may be almost imperceptible. In such cases, membership in a consortium may actually be more costly in terms of actual results. The money may be available, but it may be put to no useful purpose. And eventually the people who represent the institutions may simply cease to care about making efforts to cooperate. The point is that consortia are neither automatic successes nor failures. An agreement to cooperate is worthless unless the institutions in question are capable of, and willing to, cooperate.

Although in certain respects the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium has been somewhat atypical, its experiences seem to be those common to consortia, or any other cooperative undertaking. The NCJEC has been largely successful, we feel, but certainly not completely. Its history is illustrative of the difficulties and the possibilities inherent in institutional-governmental cooperation.

LEAA AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NCJEC

In accordance with the intent of the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970 and the 1971 amendments to the Act, LEAA was authorized to enter into contracts with institutions of higher education to develop or strengthen criminal justice education. As a means of implementing the program, LEAA sent applications for concept papers to approximately 1,000 institutions in 1971. The "Participation Criteria for Educational Development Program" established by the Manpower Development Assistance Division specified five areas of interest:

1. Curriculum development (defined as "development of new criminal justice programs and/or expansion or revision of existing programs")
2. Research
3. Development of educational materials
4. Education and improvement of faculty
5. Development of centers of excellence.

Later, as it became obvious that there would be limitations in available funds for this program, parts two, three, and four were dropped in favor of a more concentrated effort on part one, "Curriculum Development," and part five, "Centers of Excellence." As stated in the "Participation Criteria," the purpose of the Centers of Excellence would be: "To expand existing and well-established criminal justice programs into Centers of Excellence in which new curricula and teaching technologies would be developed for improving criminal justice education."

About 300 institutions responded by submitting concept papers; an Educational Review Panel met in November 1971 and recommended that 14 of the schools responding should submit full proposals for graduate level programs and 9 should submit proposals as Centers of Excellence. After reviewing the recommendations, LEAA did not award funds to any institutions but directed staff members to develop a new approach for utilization of funds. Requests for Proposal (RFP's) for a Centers of Excellence Program were mailed early in 1972 to 302 institutions as a result of this new approach.

After several phases of the selection process, one of which was a site visit to some of the institutions, four institutions were recommended as National Centers of Excellence. These institutions were Marquette University, The University of Southern California, the State University of New York at Albany, and the University of Alabama. In conjunction with these national centers, eleven regional centers were also recommended. After considerable debate within LEAA regarding the recommendations, LEAA's Associate Administrators vetoed implementation of the Centers of Excellence program. Shortly thereafter, the Administrator of LEAA, Jerris Leonard, resigned and a new selection process was begun.

Although numerous changes had been made in the overall concept of the Educational Development Program, it was decided that new requests for proposal would not be distributed, with the understanding that institutions which had submitted proposals for the Centers of Excellence would become eligible for consideration in this new selection process. Early discussion of this revised program presented the possibility of funding five or six institutions at approximately $600,000 each. It was also suggested that at least one institution with a forensic science program be included among the grantees, which should be selected by June 30, 1973.

As part of the selection process, each LEAA Regional Office was asked to provide recommendations, and both Norval Jesperson, Acting Assistant Administrator of the Office of Education and Manpower Assistance (OEMA), and Carl Hamm, OEMA Program Manager, conducted pre-site-visit evaluations of the proposals. A final list of institutions was submitted to new LEAA Administrator Donald Santarelli who, with his Deputy Administrators, made the final selection.

On July 1, 1973, grant awards were finalized for the National Criminal Justice Educational Development Program to Michigan State University, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Eastern Kentucky University, Arizona State University, and Northeastern University. On October 1, 1973, grants were awarded to Portland State University and the University of Maryland, College Park. Why those institutions selected as Centers of Excellence were not considered as Consortium institutions is not clearly documented. However, it appears that there was a concern on the part of LEAA to totally remove the "Centers of Excellence" labeling from the new program.

Some of the criteria considered in the selection of the Consortium grantees were listed as follows:

1. Research capability for projects for future needs
2. Geographic distribution throughout the United States to meet specific problems in as many areas as possible
3. A university with international contacts
4. A university with forensic science capabilities
5. An emerging criminal justice or administration of justice program
6. A university to meet some of the unresearched Indian problems pertaining to criminal justice
7. Willingness to cooperate with other grantees and with LEAA.

It was felt that each of the grantees would provide different strengths and a unique approach to the problem of preparing people to be leaders and educators in the field of criminal justice.

Organizationally, responsibility for the Consortium grants remained with OEMA until April 1974, when it was transferred to the National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILE/CJ). In October 1975 another organizational change in LEAA produced the Task Force on Criminal Justice Education and Training, and this group was assigned responsibility for administration of the Consortium grants. In April 1976 the task force was disbanded, and the new Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training assumed responsibility for the grants. Dr. J. Price Foster was appointed Director of this new Office. Although these changes never altered the terms or conditions of the institutional grants, each transfer of responsibility was accompanied by a period of some uncertainty and the necessity to adjust to new personnel, some of whom were unfamiliar with the Consortium and its history and unacquainted with its members.

CHAPTER 2. ORGANIZATION OF THE CONSORTIUM

CONSORTIUM BYLAWS/AGREEMENT

The first meeting of the original five grantees was held at Michigan State University on July 13, 1973, and the primary topic for discussion was the organizational structure of the proposed Consortium. It should be noted that the term "consortium" was used by LEAA officials from the onset of the grants and was not chosen by the grantees as a title. It was agreed that a document should be prepared to outline the objectives and purpose of the Consortium and to formalize the commitment of the individual institutions to the Consortium concept. John McNamara, Project Director at Michigan State University, was asked to prepare a set of Consortium Bylaws for presentation and discussion at a later meeting. During the course of this meeting, Deputy Administrator Richard Velde presented LEAA's views concerning the overall objectives of the Consortium.

At a meeting held the next month at Eastern Kentucky University, Dr. McNamara presented a first draft of the proposed

"Consortium Bylaws." This document was thoroughly studied, and it was agreed that a second draft would be prepared after a review of suggestions by Project Directors for revisions and additions. At this time Norval Jesperson also suggested that a formal document, to be called the "Consortium Agreement," should be prepared for signature by the President or Chancellor of each member institution. This agreement would serve to specify the extent to which the universities would "consort" and with whom, while in no way contradicting the terms of the individual grant conditions.

On October 3, 1973, the Board of Directors of the Consortium, composed of the Project Directors of each member institution, was formalized and Dr. McNamara was elected Chairman of the Board. Also at this meeting a draft of the Consortium Agreement was presented for review and discussion by the Project Directors. Each Project Director provided input concerning the final draft of this document, which was officially adopted by the member institutions at a meeting held in Washington, D. C., on November 14, 1973. It was decided that this agreement was sufficient for formal organization of the Consortium, and further development of additional "bylaws" was not pursued.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The governing body of the NCJEC was a Board of Directors comprised of the Project Directors from the seven institutions. A Project Director was identified at the time of application for funding as the individual who would bear major responsibility for the management of grant activities and expenditures and who would be the principal representative of the institution to the Consortium and LEAA. Circumstances varied at the different institutions, and the Project Director might or might not hold an administrative or faculty position in a functioning criminal justice program. Procedural regulations for operation of the Board of Directors stipulated that each Project Director, or his designee, should have one vote in matters before the Board and that motions should only be made by Board members.

As has been stated, John McNamara of Michigan State University was elected Chairman of the Board of Directors in October of 1973; he served in that office through reelection until June 1975. Filling an expressed need for someone to assist in these duties and preside in the Chairman's absence, Peter Lejins of the University of Maryland was elected Vice Chairman of the Board in June of 1974. The following April, Dr. Lejins was elected to a one-year term as Chairman, with Norman Rosenblatt of Northeastern University as Vice Chairman. In September 1976 Don Gibbons of Portland State University was elected Chairman after the Board of Directors voted to continue the Consortium on a voluntary basis for an additional year without new LEAA allocations. Duties of the Chairman of the Board included preparation of agendas for both regular and special meetings of the Consortium, chairing of meetings, reviewing of meeting minutes prior to distribution, and representing the Board as requested.

OFFICE OF THE COORDINATOR

At the first meeting of the grantees, Mr. Velde had suggested that a "coordinating office or secretariat" be established to coordinate the activities of the Consortium. The idea was again presented at the next meeting. After much discussion concerning the best location, Arizona State University indicated its willingness to house such an office, and it was agreed that a proposal would be prepared for submission to LEAA by Arizona State University for funding of an "Office of the Coordinator."

Arizona State University submitted this proposal to LEAA in September 1973. The proposal indicated that Arizona State University would serve only to house the office and, as required under LEAA guidelines, would act as a fiscal monitor fo the expenditure of grant funds. It was distinctly understood that the functioning of the Coordinator's Office would in no way come under the individual direction of the Project Directo of the Consortium grant at Arizona State University. In all matters of policy and program, the Coordinator would be respon sible to the Board of Directors of the Consortium.

Notice of the grant award for the Office of the Coordinator was received by ASU officials on November 16, 1973, at which time the Office began to function with a staff of one project assistant and one part-time secretary. Shortly thereafter, the LEAA Program Manager's Office was moved to Tempe, Arizona. The Board of Directors acknowledged that the Progra

Manager could continue to function as Coordinator to assist in the establishment of that Office until a Coordinator could be hired.

To facilitate the hiring of a Coordinator, it was agreed that notice of the position opening would be circulated only among the Consortium institutions, with a deadline for applications set at January 15, 1974. LEAA officials advised the Board of Directors that this would be allowable under guidelines for fair employment practices. Because of the limited number of applications received from Consortium institution faculties, it became obvious that a Coordinator would not be selected following the January 15 deadline. The Board of Directors then decided that notice of the position opening should be circulated nationwide and that the deadline for applications should be extended to March 15, 1974, with an expected hiring date of June 1, 1974. In the interim, Armand P. Hernandez, a faculty member at Arizona State University, was appointed Acting Coordinator.

Originally the Board of Directors had envisioned that a nationally prominent individual in the criminal justice field would be selected as Coordinator. All position announcements and job descriptions were circulated with this image in mind; however, later developments in the organizational structure and personnel of LEAA led to a reconsideration of this concept. Since the Coordinator was to function under the direction of the Board, it was decided that national recognition in criminal justice should no longer be a primary criterion for the positio

The changes resulting from transfer of responsibility for the grants to NILE/CJ in April 1974 affected the appointment of a Coordinator, as some uncertainty arose concerning the operation of the Coordinator's Office and its location and relationship to NILE/CJ officials. A move by NILE/CJ to relocate the office to Washington, D. C., was strongly opposed by the Board of Directors, who were concerned that it would come under the direct supervision of LEAA, thus restricting its usefulness as a facilitator of Consortium activities.

As of June 1, 1974, the expected hiring date, no agreement had been reached by the Board of Directors and LEAA concerning final selection of a Coordinator from among those candidates who had been interviewed. On June 20, 1974, the Acting Coordinator, Dr. Hernandez, was named permanent Coordinator During this period the functioning of the Coordinator's Office was hampered by frequent misunderstandings between the Board of Directors and LEAA officials concerning the proper role and function of the Coordinator.

Of primary concern to the Board of Directors was LEAA's desire that the Coordinator serve as an evaluator of the Consortium institutions and that he receive direction from LEAA officials pertaining to matters such as site visitations, monitoring duties, and projected activities for the Office. The Board of Directors maintained that the Office of the Coordinator should function at its discretion to facilitate only those activities specified in the proposal for the Coordinator's Office grant. In December 1974, presumably as a result of this conflict, Dr. Hernandez resigned as Coordinator to return to classroom teaching.

A new Coordinator, Gilbert H. Bruns, who had previously served as Research Director of the Center of Criminal Justice at Arizona State University, was appointed by the Board of Directors effective January 1, 1975. Prior to this appointment, the Board of Directors had agreed upon the development of the multi-volume Consortium Reports. This project would be a major undertaking and would demand much of the time and effort of the Coordinator's Office. With LEAA's approval of the project and the role which the Coordinator's Office would play in its development and completion, much of the previous controversy concerning that Office's role and function was resolved.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

In establishing the basic organizational structure of the Consortium, plans were made for a standing Research Committee composed of the Research Directors from the member institutions Although LEAA continually encouraged--and the Consortium Agreement required--their employment, it was some time before all institutions were able to locate and contract Research Directors. Because the position was for a limited period of time and funded through grant monies, neither professional rank nor tenure could be offered as an incentive for employment. This made it very difficult to recruit criminal justice researchers who, because of their limited numbers, were already in great demand and in most cases held more stable positions. In addition, by the time recruitment was under way, the academic year had already begun and most candidates were under contract for the remainder of that year. As a result, full membership of the Research Committee was not complete for several months, as acting directors or other staff filled in until regular directors could be hired.

Limited in decision-making powers, the Committee served mainly as an advisory group to the Board of Directors and formulated recommendations for their action. With regard to their function as a group, it was understood that each Research Director would have first responsibility to his Project Director rather than to the Consortium as a whole.

During its early developmental stages, Gilbert Bruns, then Research Director at Arizona State University's Center of Criminal Justice, acted as Chairman Pro Tem of the Research Committee. In February 1974, Robert Ullman of Eastern Kentucky University was elected Chairman. He resigned that position in December 1974 due to an assignment to another Consortium project and was succeeded by Ralph Lewis from Michigan State University.

CHAPTER 3. JOINT ACTIVITIES

As planning for research efforts progressed, it became increasingly evident that participation in joint activities would not be as easily accomplished as had been anticipated. In accordance with the primary objectives of the grant awards, most of the time and energies of the various Project Directors and their staffs were concentrated on developments within their individual programs. Also, it was not easy to decide upon projects which would be beneficial to all Consortium members, as they were each at different stages of program and curriculum development. Continued efforts, however, resulted in many activities which have proven rewarding and worthy of the time and effort required for their completion. It is impossible to provide a detailed account of all these activities; the following pages present a brief overview with some reference to problems which were encountered and solutions which were adopted to overcome those difficulties.

RESEARCH

From the beginning of the grant period it was anticipated that all activities related to joint research efforts would be the responsibility of the standing Research Committee composed of the Research Directors from the member institutions of the Consortium. Primarily for this reason, the Research Committee members were asked to attend all Consortium meetings and to schedule additional meetings as needed. As mentioned earlier, the formation of this committee took several months as temporary members substituted until permanent Research Directors could be recruited and hired.

The Research Committee considered many areas of interest which could provide bases for joint research efforts. Many of the ideas were eliminated because of the short life span of the Consortium or limitations of funds available for research. In discussions concerning possible research projects, it became evident that there was some disparity between what LEAA expected of the Consortium in the way of research and what was realistically possible within its academic framework. Perhaps the major role of the Research Directors in most institutions was that of a facilitator, providing research guidance for graduate students in their thesis and dissertation preparation and advising them in their academic and professional development, rather than being involved in so-called "Rand-type research organization" activity on a nationwide level. Under the Consortium grants at most member institutions, limited personnel were available to do the type of research anticipated by LEAA. Even if there had been sufficient personnel, the lack of adequate funds and the restrictions placed upon developmental research within each university would certainly have curtailed such activities considerably. Another difficulty in determining areas for research was the difference in needs and interests of the seven institutions. The various programs at that time represented a wide range in degrees of sophistication. Some were well established, with background and expertise in research efforts, while others were only in the infant stages of developing a research capability. Some did not have the graduate faculty needed for extensive research projects. These contributing factors made it difficult to determine areas of research which would be beneficial to all those involved and at the same time be in accordance with the primary objective of the grants, which was to develop and strengthen graduate programs in criminal justice. These complications, however, are believed to be common to and typical of consortia--perhaps somewhat aggravated by the distance among the affiliated universities and the limited time span of the grants.

MANPOWER SURVEY

One topic which was of interest to all institutions was the projection of future requirements for graduates of criminal justice master's and doctoral programs. Eastern Kentucky University was particularly interested in this subject as it had been specifically written into their grant award that their institution would conduct a manpower study--at least within the

Atlanta Region. Robert Ullman of Eastern Kentucky University was asked to direct a Consortium research effort in manpower needs projections. Some months later, he reported that EKU was in the process of conducting a manpower study of the need for graduate degree holders in criminal justice by contacting colleges and universities in the Atlanta Region. A copy of EKU's survey was disseminated, and it was suggested that the survey be expanded to all seven Consortium regions. It was assumed that each Project Director would adapt the survey as appropriat to his own region. This initial work in manpower research soor became a concentrated effort as the Research Directors assumed responsibility for gathering the data presented in Volume III of the Consortium Reports. In December 1974 Dr. Ullman was asked to oversee completion of this national survey of the neec for criminal justice graduates holding master's and doctoral degrees. In addition to surveying educational institutions, the Volume III study was designed to include surveys of the following: research agencies, State Planning Agencies, LEAA National and Regional Offices, training agencies, and operation al agencies. Each Research Director was responsible for comple tion of the survey within his region. The remaining regions were covered by those institutions whose regions were sparsely populated and thus required less time to survey.

An intensive effort was made to achieve as complete a response to the survey as possible, and in a meeting in June 1975 a goal of a response rate of 100 percent was agreed upon. In addition to the survey prepared by the Research Committee, meetings were held with Harold Wool of the National Planning Association (NPA) to discuss the possibility of a cooperative effort with that organization in the National Manpower Survey it was planning to conduct. Agreements were reached in which several questions pertinent to the needs of the Consortium survey were added to the questionnaire developed by NPA. A similar agreement was made with the National Association of Law Enforcement Training Agencies as they prepared to survey criminal justice training agencies. These arrangements did pose some problems, however, especially in the coordination of time tables. Each organization was operating under a different schedule, and final completion was spread over several months as delays in one or another of the organizations affected accumulation of all necessary data. In the time following completion of the regional surveys, several Research Directors decided to use the data they had gathered for an even more exhaustive study of the manpower needs within their states and regions. Such studies have been made and are available from Arizona State University, Eastern Kentucky University, Portland State University, and the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

The other major project of the Research Committee was the development of an instrument to be used in self-evaluation of the Consortium institutions and perhaps also as a model evaluation instrument that might be useful to people outside the Consortium as well. This project received first priority because all of the member institutions had self-evaluation as a requirement of their grant awards. Design of an appropriate common instrument proved to be a difficult task, however, as the institutions were at different stages of development and would be progressing in quite different phases. After several meetings resulting in various draft models, a final model was presented to members of the Board of Directors in April 1974 for their review. The following June, the Board expressed its approval of the instrument and suggested that it be implemented at the individual institutions as soon as possible. It should be noted that this instrument was designed for use by the members of the Consortium on an individual basis and at no time was intended to be utilized for evaluation of the Consortium as a whole. Realization of the additional need for a comprehensive evaluation of the effort, effect, and process of the Consortium itself later gave rise to the idea of producing these Consortium Reports.

MEETINGS AS SEMINARS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

LEAA had specifically directed that Consortium members should hold meetings on a regular basis. The purpose of these meetings was to provide opportunity for sharing of information and for giving advice and counsel to one another and LEAA. The meetings also would be a time for planning activities and engaging in discussions concerning specific problems relating to the criminal justice system in general and criminal justice graduate education in particular. During the first year of the grants, which was also the time of most planning and development at the individual institutions, meetings were held on a monthly basis. Location of the meetings alternated among the member institutions, except on one occasion when arrangements were made to meet along with the annual gathering of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.

After the first formative year, it was agreed that general Consortium meetings should be held on a bimonthly basis, with special meetings of the Board of Directors and other subcommittees called as needed. Locations for these meetings were arranged for easy accessibility by and economy for those attendir

As the third and final year of the grants approached, most phases of planning and development had been completed by the individual institutions, and activity was directed more toward implementation and operation of programs. Consortium projects were already outlined, and work was well under way on their completion. For these reasons it was agreed that meetings woul be scheduled less frequently and special meetings would be called as the need arose.

Travel to meetings was originally limited to three representatives from each institution, including the Project Directors and Research Directors. In the latter months of the grants, this was further restricted and only two representative from each institution were allowed to attend meetings unless special permission was granted by LEAA officials. Special guests were frequently asked to speak or make presentations at Consortium meetings, and representatives of State Justice

Planning Agencies and LEAA Washington and Regional Offices were regularly invited to attend. The relationship established between these offices and their corresponding Consortium institutions often proved very important to the efforts of the individual universities, as well as to the Consortium as a whole. When meetings were held on a campus, the host institution often used this opportunity to introduce new faculty members and graduate students to Consortium activities. As many as 40 individuals were sometimes present; however, the number was generally between 25 and 30.

These regular meetings of representatives of the Consortium schools had a function quite apart from the obvious one of dealing with managerial and procedural issues. One of the significant by-products of these meetings was the opportunity for these criminal justice educators to come together seminar-fashion to discuss the problems encountered at each institution as they worked toward the grant goals and objectives.

As described elsewhere in this Report, the first regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium took place on July 18-19, 1973. This meeting, and the two that followed shortly thereafter, can perhaps best be termed organizational in character and were held prior to the nomination of two of the participating universities. Beginning with the meeting of October 3-4, 1973, at Northeastern University, representatives of all seven Consortium institutions have consistently taken part. These Consortium meetings could be described as a series of seminars devoted, for the most part to the consideration of issues in criminal justice graduate education by a group of faculty from seven universities vitally involved in the subject matter. Along with the expected exchange of ideas, opportunity was provided for the presentation of proposed, existing, or revised master's and doctoral program plans for review and discussion. This proved to be very helpful, since ideas were presented for possible changes and/or improvements as the Project Directors offered new perspectives on each program. An added benefit accrued when one institution ex periencing a problem described specific remedies being employed to other Consortium members having similar difficulties. Examples were Northeastern University's use of programmed instruction for disadvantaged students struggling to master statistics and Michigan State University's system of teaching students on the undergraduate level how to be consumers of research, while on the graduate level concentrating on how to be producers of research.

In addition to the regular participants, at many meetings experts were invited to present papers or express their views on topics of concern to the Consortium. In December 1973 Charles Smith spoke on Project STAR, providing a detailed and authoritative review of key occupational and professional roles in the field of criminal justice, with a view to gaining a perspective on the educational needs of such personnel. At the same meeting Gary Copus of the Job Information Center at Sam Houston State University informed Consortium representatives about the work being done in student placement and presented a proposal for development of a national placement center. At the June 1974 meeting, Peter Haynes, then of the Judicial Administration Program at the University of Southern California at Los Angeles, discussed the need for development of curricula in court administration and offered to assist individual institutions interested in implementing a program. Saleem A. Shah of the National Institute of Mental Health addressed the meeting of September 1974 on the subject of the Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency and the research and training projects being undertaken there. The December 1974 meeting was attended by Harold Wool of the National Planning Association. The national manpower survey being planned by that organization was described in detail, and arrangements were made for cooperation with a related survey to be undertaken by the Consortium.

Representatives of Howard University were encouraged to attend Consortium meetings and participate in discussions held in the hope that the experiences shared would be useful to them as they planned for their new programs. In December 1974 Lee Brow and Laurence Gary of Howard University told the group about their institution's grant to develop the first major criminal justice program at a Black university. Ray H. Williams and Clinton Jones attended the meeting and conference on doctoral education in Omaha in October 1975. In these get-togethers, the problem of minority involvement in the criminal justice system received considerable attention.

Various LEAA representatives attended Consortium meetings during the three-year grant period. The project Program Manage attended the meetings on a regular basis, but other LEAA personnel from the regional offices as well as from Washington participated in Consortium discussions. The discussions provided a unique opportunity for the academic community and LEAA to engage in meaningful dialogue pertaining to manpower and criminal justice curriculum development over an extended period of time. In the past meetings had been generally with ad hoc committees for short periods of time; due to the nature of the committee structure, these provided opportunities for discussion of specific manpower issues only with limited advisory input. Perhaps for the first time, the Consortium forum enabled criminal justice educators and LEAA personnel, over an extended period of time, to become acquainted with the intricacies of their respective organizations so that maximum joint efforts could be exerted to provide solutions to the complex problems of criminal justice manpower development.

Perhaps the most extensive inquiry and discussion by the Board of Directors was that of the content, structure, and academic setting of doctoral programs in criminal justice. After a number of preliminary Board discussions, this topic was made the subject of a special three-day conference convened by the University of Nebraska at Omaha in October of 1975 (see Volume IV of these Reports). At this conference directors and representatives of most of the non-Consortium doctoral programs in criminal justice in this country discussed and analyzed the key issues in criminal justice graduate education. Thus a forum was provided for interchange of information, experiences, and views between the representatives of Consortium universities and suc schools as the State University of New York at Albany, John Ja College of Criminal Justice, Florida State University, and Sam Houston State University, to mention only the major programs. Such leaders in the field of graduate criminal justice educati as Richard A. Myren, Donald M. Riddle, George G. Killinger, an Eugene M. Czajkoski took part in the meeting and conference.

At this conference members of Consortium and non-Consorti universities met and discussed the possibility of forming an organization composed of schools offering doctoral programs in criminal justice. A decision was made to establish such an association, a steering committee selected, and affiliation wi the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences agreed upon. At the ACJS meeting in April 1976, the American Association of Doctor Programs in Criminal Justice and Criminology was formed, and Peter Lejins, Chairman of the Board of the NCJEC, elected Pres dent.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

Every Consortium meeting can be said to have been an exer cise in technology transfer, which was one of the primary charges from LEAA to its grantees. Minutes of all meetings we sent to the State Planning Agencies of those states in which Consortium schools were located, as well as to the correspondi LEAA Regional Offices. However, the opportunity to share info mation and knowledge about criminal justice higher education w also enhanced by attendance of Consortium personnel at meeting of other criminal justice professional associations. In some cases, such as the National Association of Administrators of Criminal Justice State Planning Associations, the Coordinator and/or the Chairman of the Board attended as representatives of the entire Consortium. In others, such as the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences and the International Association of Chiefs of Police, all those who held membership were encouraged to attend. Those of the Consortium who were members of additional associations were asked to share information gained from those meetings which might be pertinent to Consortium efforts. In turn, members of the Consortium were able to exchange ideas concerning Consortium activities while in attendance at these outside meetings.

With his many international contacts, Peter Lejins was often a voice of the Consortium beyond the boundaries of the United States, at the same time relaying to the Project Directors news of what was taking place abroad in the field of criminal justice. Meetings on which he reported included: the International Penal and Penitentiary Foundation Study Conference in Helsinki; the 11th International Congress on Penal Law in Budapest, Hungary; the First and Second International Symposium of the International Center of Biological and Medico-Legal Criminology in Sao Paulo, Brazil; the First Social Defense Symposium in Latin America, in Caracas, Venezuela; the International Society for Criminology in Paris; the Brazilian Congress on Criminal Law in Sao Paulp; the Scientific Commission of the International Society for Criminology in Paris; the International

Colloquium on Incarceration and Its New Forms in Bellagio, Italy; the Symposium on the Diagnosis of Dangerous Offenders in Genoa, Italy; and the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders in Geneva. For the latter, Project Directors assisted Dr. Lejins in the preparation of the National Report for the United States, distributed in five languages and later published as a monograph.

As progress was made in program development at the various institutions, activities increased which involved dissemination of information to educational institutions and criminal justice agencies outside of the Consortium. This was also the result of increased attention to, and awareness of, the Consortium and its activities on the part of others involved in criminal justice higher education.

Several publications were produced in response to inquiries received concerning the Consortium, its activities, criminal justice education in general, and criminal justice graduate education in particular. Most of these publications were produced by the Office of the Coordinator; however, some were products of single or joint efforts of Consortium members. One such work was a bibliography of criminal justice library materials produced jointly by Arizona State University and Portland State University. Entitled Criminal Justice: A Multi-Disciplinary Bibliography, this is a comprehensive listing indexed according to subject and including over 5000 entries. Response from educators and students alike has shown that this bibliography is particularly valuable in curriculum development and as an aid in teaching and studying. Portland State University has produced additional annotated bibliographies that have been well receive

Two editions of a National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium brochure were developed for distribution on a nation al level. The first edition, which was produced in the early stages of the Consortium, presented an overview of the general purpose of the organization, with its goals and objectives. Th second was produced at approximately the midpoint of the grant period and focused more upon the individual institutions and th status of their programs. Both editions were distributed to al educational institutions with criminal justice or closely relat ed programs and to appropriate criminal justice agencies. The second edition also proved helpful in answering the many inquiries from educators and students concerning the programs of the seven institutions.

In December 1974 the quarterly NCJEC Newsletter was first produced and nationally distributed. Designed as a vehicle for dissemination of information about work being done by the Consortium members and pertinent developments in the field of criminal justice higher education, the Newsletter included articles addressed to such topics as program evaluation, LEEP funds, job placement, and seminars and symposia being held. As a regular feature, each edition contained a biography of a Project Director at one of the Consortium universities, as well as a descriptive article on the criminal justice program at a Consortium school. Distribution of the Newsletter was the same as that of the NCJEC brochure. In response to requests, copies were also sent to many individuals, including educators, students, and criminal justice operational personnel, resulting in a total distribution of almost 1200 copies per issue.

Soon after the Office of the Coordinator was established, requests began to arrive for information about programs in crim inal justice graduate education (i.e., what institutions offere programs; what types of programs were offered; how many program existed; who could offer assistance in developing certain types of programs). In order to answer these inquiries and because such existing compendiums as the Directory of the International Association of Chiefs of Police proved to be overly oriented toward the area of law enforcement, rather than education for and about the system of criminal justice, the Coordinator's Office began to accumulate information about institutions throughout the nation offering criminal justice graduate education. This gave rise in June 1974 to a project approved by the Board of Directors in which a concentrated effort was made to identif all institutions in the United States administering criminal justice master's or doctoral programs. The net result of this project was the publication of a <u>Criminal Justice Graduate Programs Catalog</u> in which 78 institutions are listed, with 91 master's and 10 existing as well as 7 proposed doctoral programs identified. Included in the catalog is a brief description of each program along with requirements for admission and graduation and, where possible, course offerings. Since its publication in January 1975, a Supplement has been produced which iden tifies 31 additional institutions offering 35 master's and 3 doctoral programs; this Supplement was mailed in July 1975 to all recipients of the original catalog. An additional 8 universities having graduate programs have since been identified and have provided the Coordinator's Office with program information More than 250 of these catalogs have been distributed to universities and libraries nationwide, and general response has indicated that it is the most accurate and complete study of its kind available at this time.

The success of the Criminal Justice Graduate Programs Catalog led to a second publication in which undergraduate criminal justice programs are identified. Due to the large number of such programs, the catalog includes only those offered by four-year institutions and resulting in a bachelor's degree. Also, because of the flexibility of such programs, more general information is presented, with a concentration upon an overall description of the type of program that is offered. Some 282 institutions administering 305 bachelor's programs are identified in the catalog, which was completed and distributed in February 1976.

These catalogs have prompted very favorable comment from criminal justice educators. The undergraduate catalog provides an opportunity for taking a look at the state of the art at present and shows the wide variation that exists between subsystem-type programs and those that present an overview of the entire system of criminal justice, between programs offering courses of a near-training nature and those requiring thorough grounding in the social sciences. There is evidence of a proliferation of programs that developed without regard for what else existed, and the time may be ripe for the building of some conceptual models by graduate students and researchers in an effort to set some standards. Both catalogs, of course, have merit from the standpoint of advisement of students.

One of the most successful publications of the Coordinator Office has been the brochure entitled "Careers in Criminal Justice." Designed primarily to acquaint potential criminal justice students with career opportunities within the system, more than 8800 copies of this brochure are in circulation. Included in the 16-page pamphlet is a brief overview of the types of careers which can be anticipated for the individual at all levels of education, as well as general information concerning volunteer organizations, equal opportunities, and the need for those with professional degrees such as computer sciences, chemistry, research, and planning. In accordance with the objectives of the Consortium, specific attention is given to the need for higher education within the criminal justice system.

Although not published, copies of the proposals for graduate programs developed at the Consortium universities were ofte requested by other institutions which were in the early stages of developing similar programs. These proved to be of great assistance to many, both for program development and curriculum revision.

The Coordinator's Office was able to be of similar assistance early in 1975 to a consortium of ten traditionally Black colleges and universities known as Positive Futures, Inc., (PFI and funded by LEAA to develop and test a model criminal justice program of research, training, and education for minorities. A copy of the evaluation model developed by the Consortium Resear Directors was sent to Roosevelt Johnson of PFi, who was invited to contact the Project Directors for information and assistance at any time.

FACULTY AND STUDENT EXCHANGE

FACULTY EXCHANGE

The subject of faculty exchange was approached from severa angles. An early recommendation was that the Office of the Coordinator should serve as a clearinghouse for exchange, and resumes of all Consortium faculty and staff members were to be collected there. In December 1974 a questionnaire was prepared and distributed to each Project Director for responses concerning points which would have to be considered prior to any exchange activities. The questions dealt with such matters as salary differentials, payment of travel expenses, and fringe benefits. A tabulation of responses to these questionnaires wa compiled by the Coordinator's Office, and a summary was present at the next Consortium meeting in December; at that time it was agreed that problems such as those presented by the questionnai would have to be solved on an individual basis according to the specific institutions and individuals involved. The Project Directors agreed to communicate with one another concerning facul members interested in participating in the exchange program, after which negotiations would commence.

During the next year, very little progress was made in the way of actual exchange activities. In most instances the faculties of the several institutions had been hired only with the beginning of the grant period, and they did not find it advisable to take a quarter or semester away from a new position. Project Directors were eager to accept exchanges from other universities but were reluctant to agree to the departure, however temporary, of their own faculty members. Many expressed the view that a quarter or semester would be an awkward length of time for exchange from the standpoint of both funding and satisfactory living arrangements. The distance to be traveled posed problems for those with families and other university and community responsibilities. In June 1975, in an effort to provide an alternative which might solve some of these problems, the Coordinator's Office introduced a new approach to the subject of faculty exchange. An intensive effort was made to contact each faculty member of each Consortium school regarding his or her interest in participating in a short-term faculty exchange program. Attention was focused on the use of exchange faculty for special courses such as seminars, colloquia, intensive semester courses, and modular courses. Utilization of exchange faculty in this manner would eliminate many of the problems associated with long-term exchange but would still allow for sharing of expertise to be found among the various faculties. Response to this concept was very encouraging.

During the fall semester of 1975, several Consortium representatives were on the program of the Conference on Key Issues in Criminal Justice Doctoral Education sponsored by the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Papers were presented by Don Gibbons and Gerald Blake of Portland State University, John Hudzik of Michigan State University, and James Parker of Northeastern University. Commentaries were delivered by Ralph Turner and John McNamara of Michigan State University, Peter Lejins of the University of Maryland, James Fox of Eastern Kentucky University, Gayle Shuman of Arizona State University, and Norman Rosenblatt of Northeastern University. Some of the topics discussed in the Conference and some of the papers presented were made use of in the preparation of Volume IV of the Consortium Reports.

The University of Maryland convened two meetings in the same semester in which Consortium faculty took part. An International Seminar on Socio-cultural Factors in Nonmedical Drug Use was held in November, and the First National Conference on Private Security took place in December, both on the College Park campus. James Fox of Eastern Kentucky University and Peter Lejins of Maryland participated in the drug seminar; Leon Weaver of Michigan State University, Robert Croatti of Northeastern University, and Peter Lejins of Maryland took part in the private security conference. Also in December of that year Arizona State University presented a colloquium prior to the regular Consortium meeting in Tempe. Speakers were James Fox of Eastern Kentucky University, Don Gibbons of Portland State University, Peter Lejins of the University of Maryland, and Norman Rosenblatt of Northeastern University.

In the spring of 1976 the Project Director of Portland State University, Don Gibbons, taught an intensive semester course entitled Trends and Issues in Criminal Justice at Arizona State University. The course was presented in two three-day weekends.

There was also a type of faculty interaction, if not exchange, connected with the joint doctoral programs of Eastern Kentucky University, as explained in their report in Volume I, in that Eastern Kentucky University faculty members sat on doctoral committees of students enrolled at one of the universities cooperating in the administration of the joint doctorate.

STUDENT EXCHANGE

Student exchange--the concept of students from one Consortium institution taking a portion of their coursework at another Consortium school and then returning to their home university to finish their programs--was implemented to some extent but did not realize the full potential desired. Preliminary investigation indicated that such factors as cost of travel, transferability of LEEP funds, and differences in academic calendars led to lack of desire on the part of students to initiate exchange action. However, there was considerable activity in such areas as counseling students pertaining to programs available at other institutions, providing Consortium brochures and other items of information, and, in the latter stages, developing colloquia involving the interaction of students and faculty from different Consortium institutions. After three years of

Consortium activity, there have been a number of students who have completed a program at one Consortium university and then enrolled at another Consortium institution to do graduate work.

Although in the strictest sense difficult to classify as student exchange, the joint doctoral program developed by Eastern Kentucky University with the University of Maryland and Michigan State University enables students to begin their programs at one institution and complete them at another. In June 1974 the joint program between Eastern Kentucky University and the University of Maryland was formally approved, and in December of that year similar programs were formulated with the University of Kentucky, the University of Louisville, and Michigan State University. Several students are already participating in these programs, and several more are anticipating entrance upon completion of the necessary requirements or approval. A detailed description of these programs can be found in the Eastern Kentucky University chapter of Volume I of these Reports.

PLACEMENT ACTIVITIES

Reference was made earlier to the December 1973 visit to a Consortium meeting of Gary Copus, who explained the operation of the Job Information Center at Sam Houston State University and offered a proposal for development of a national placement center. Consideration was given to making this a Consortium project by the Project Directors, and a task force was assigned to investigate the feasibility of setting up centers additional to the one serving the State of Texas. It was ultimately decided that such an undertaking would be beyond the scope of the Consortium as a whole, but an alternate proposal for a network of local and regional placement centers was formulated. Northeastern University was nominated to conduct a pilot placement program. In addition, Michigan State University made a study, funded by LEAA and shared with the other Consortium schools, of its graduates and their placement and utilization.

In this connection, the Office of the Coordinator attempted to assist graduates of Consortium universities through circulation of announcements for position openings. By means of direct correspondence with each graduate and prospective graduate of the criminal justice programs at the Consortium institutions, a file of resumes was established. Each individual was asked to indicate in which particular job areas he or she had an interest, and as position announcements were received by the Coordinator's Office, copies were sent to those graduates or prospective graduates who might qualify. The <u>NCJEC Newsletter</u> proved useful in both advertising the service and soliciting announcements for position openings. No attempt was made to act as an employment agency; the service was merely informational.

ADVISORY COUNCIL TO LEAA

The interaction between LEAA and the NCJEC proved to be an area of mutual benefit. Consortium representatives served as a sounding board and advisory council for some of LEAA's regulations. Guidelines for such manpower-related programs as LEEP, graduate research fellowships, and internships were formulated and revised with the assistance of Consortium personnel for the benefit of all institutions of higher education with criminal justice-related programs. This was a rare opportunity for universities to act in an advisory capacity to an agency of government over an extended period of time, rather than for the usually limited duration of a committee serving as consultant on a specific issue.

Special consideration was often given to students at Consortium universities. In fiscal year 1974 authorization was granted for LEEP funding of eligible new graduate and undergraduate pre-service students at the Consortium schools, a privilege which was not accorded to non-Consortium institutions. Later, when proposals were made for extensive cuts in the budget for LEEP, the Consortium joined with other institutions in a concerted effort to block such cutbacks. Letters were sent to Congressmen and budget committee members to express the educators' concern, and eventually the funds were restored.

Formulation of the Graduate Research Fellowship Program Guidelines was accomplished in consultation with the Consortium Research Directors in the fall of 1973. Special funds were made available to Consortium universities for such fellowships, which provided support for graduate students while doing their research and/or dissertation writing. Although the dollar amounts appropriated have decreased each fiscal year, this assistance benefited a substantial number of students during the life of the grants.

Although some of the Consortium schools had been conducting internship programs in the past, the availability of special funds authorized for internships by LEAA for support of students participating in such programs for a summer, quarter, or semester permitted the development of internships with agencies and offices that had heretofore been unable to finance such efforts. There is almost unanimous agreement among criminal justice educators that this sort of first-hand experience while studying is of great importance, and students have been enthusiastic in their praise of the opportunities provided.

CHAPTER 4. ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM HISTORIES

The following analysis is based upon the program histories of the seven Consortium institutions contained in Volume I of these Reports. For several reasons, those histories vary greatly. First, there was considerable difference in the stages of program development at the seven institutions at the time of their receipt of the 406(e) grants. Two institutions--Michigan State University and the University of Maryland--had established doctoral programs in operation. One, Arizona State University, had neither an undergraduate nor a graduate program. Another, Eastern Kentucky University, had both an undergraduate and a master's program. Three--Northeastern University, Portland State University, and the University of Nebraska at Omaha--had undergraduate, but no graduate, programs in operation.

Secondly, the individual grants specified different objectives and/or different ways of meeting those objectives. For example, the objective of both Michigan State and Maryland was the strengthening of doctoral programs; however, Michigan State proposed to do so by the establishment of a research center, while Maryland chose to meet the same goal through strengthening of faculty and enrichment of curricula. As a result of this variety of objectives and methods, the nature of the obstacles encountered by the seven universities differed considerably. So did their accomplishments.

Finally, the seven program histories, written by the seven Project Directors, vary according to the individual perspectives of those Project Directors. Each dealt with the matters that seemed to him to be most significant. Consequently the absence of discussion of a subject in the program history of a particular institution--or in this analysis--does not mean that the subject is not relevant to that institution--only that, for various reasons, the Project Director chose not to write of it, preferring instead to discuss other matters which, according to his perspective, seemed more important.

For the purpose of this analysis, the authors chose to stress what seemed to them to be the most significant points--in some cases significant because recurring, in others because unique, in still others because particularly illustrative of something that seemed of considerable relevance. The analysis first deals with the administrative structure of the seven universities, then their various objectives and the obstacles met in reaching those objectives, and finally their accomplishments.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

Michigan State University was one of the pioneers in criminal justice education. In 1935, in cooperation with the National Crime Commission, Michigan State College (its title at that time) offered a "police administration course" under the administration of the Division of Applied Sciences. In 1945, the program was shifted from the Division of Applied Sciences to the Division of Business and Public Service. In the middle fifties the program became known as the School of Police Administration and Public Safety; a master's program in criminal justice was begun in 1955. In 1963 the School was moved to the College of Social Science and in 1969 began its first Ph.D. program. The doctoral program was known as the Social Science Ph.D. with the option in Criminal Justice and Criminology and was jointly administered by the College administration and the School. In 1971 the name of the School was again modified--this time to its present form, the School of Criminal Justice. The name change was considered to reflect the rich diversity of the program available within the School. Over an approximately 40-year span of time the program has progressed from a specific curriculum in police administration to a broad criminal justice system-oriented curriculum. The program has not only received national attention but has become international in scope, with more than 500 students and police officers from every part of the world enrolled.

The University of Maryland had the beginnings of a formalized criminology program in the 1930's, when basic courses in criminology were offered in the Department of Sociology. The curriculum remained in the Department of Sociology, becoming a division of that department in 1964 under the name of the Criminology Program. The division was given a certain amount of autonomy in managing the area of criminology, and a number of instructors taught courses in that area exclusively. The University did not combine its various criminal justice programs under one administration until many years after various subsystem programs had been in operation. The Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology was established in 1969. At the time of establishment, it contained only the law enforcement curriculum; the Criminology Program remained in the Department of Sociology, with the understanding that it would be transferred to the Institute in the near future. 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. With the introduction of a divisional structure at the University, the Institute became a part of the Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences, reporting directly to the Provost of that Division. In the spring of 1973, the master's program was transferred from the Department of Sociology to the Institute. Thus at the time of the receipt of the Consortium grant, the Institute was operating, in addition to its original law enforcement curriculum, the criminology program leading to the B.A. and M.A. degrees; the Ph.D. program was officially transferred to the Institute at the beginning of the spring semester of 1974.

Although Arizona State University is the oldest educational institution in the Southwest, as a university it is one of the younger Consortium institutions. Founded in 1885 as the Territorial Normal School of the Territory of Arizona, the school underwent several name changes throughout its history, becoming Arizona State University in 1958. Its criminal justice program is the youngest of the Consortium universities. The Center of Criminal Justice was originally established on December 1, 1972, and designated as the University research and service unit in the field of criminal justice. In February of 1973 the Center received a grant from the Arizona State Justice Planning Agency for the purpose of developing an undergraduate curriculum in criminal justice, and in December 1973 the Board of Regents authorized Arizona State University, through the Center of Criminal Justice, to award a bachelor of science degree in criminal justice. In August of 1974, a proposal was submitted to the Graduate Council for a master's degree in criminal justice, and in December of 1974 a master's program was approved. Early in 1975 work began on the process of developing and approving a doctoral proposal.

Eastern Kentucky University is also a relatively young university. The school dates back to 1907; it has been a four-year institution since 1922, was authorized to grant its first graduate degrees in 1948, and in 1966 was approved for university status. In 1974 its School of Law Enforcement, which had been under the College of Applied Arts and Technology, was upgraded to the status of a college, with its Dean reporting directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The College was organized into three academic departments--Police Administration, Correctional Services, and the Traffic Safety Institute. EKU's program is one of the largest law enforcement undergraduate education programs in the country. Since the state governing board has not authorized the institution to award a doctoral degree in any of its programs of study, EKU has directed itself toward the development of joint doctoral programs with other institutions.

Northeastern University, the only private institution among the seven Consortium schools, decided to emphasize the field of forensic science in its development of a doctoral program. This decision was based on the perceived needs of the criminal justice system and the basic strengths of the University. The administration of the College of Criminal Justice felt that these needs could best be served by bringing together members from the various science departments of the University to work in concert with the College of Criminal Justice to develop forensic science programs. On July 1, 1973, the Institute of Chemical Analysis, Applications and Forensic Science was established, its basic purposes being the development of graduate level research programs in forensic science and the development of curricula for master of science and Ph.D. programs in this field. Two principal divisions were established: the Organic/Biochemical Analysis Division supported by staff from the Departments of Chemistry, Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacy, and the College of Criminal Justice; and the Materials

Science/Inorganic Analysis Division supported by faculty and staff from the Departments of Chemistry, Mechanical Engineering, and Electrical Engineering. At the time of the grant, the College of Criminal Justice was just introducing a graduate program on the master's level with two concentrations of study: administration, policy development, and planning; behavioral science theory and research. The Ph.D. program in forensic chemistry admitted its first students in December of 1975.

Portland State University is the youngest of the Consortium institutions. In 1947 the Oregon State System of Higher Education created an extension unit in Portland known as the Vanport Extension Center. Vanport Center evolved into Portland State College, and eventually, in 1969, into Portland State University. Located in the only metropolitan community of any significance in the state, Portland State University is a truly urban institution. During its 25-year history, the University has grown from a handful of students to a current full-time equivalent student population of 9,500, offering bachelor's and master's degrees in nearly all of the established fields and areas of specialization.

The University entered into police science and correctional educational programs some years ago with a certificate program in law enforcement and corrections, whereby students who majored in sociology, psychology, or political science were able to take additional courses in law enforcement or corrections in order to earn a certificate, additional to the bachelor's degree. The growth of the student population has paralleled trends nationwide; in 1971 there were 75 students in the program; by 1974-75 the number of majors had grown to 410. At the present time the undergraduate Administration of Justice program is one of the largest in the entire College of Social Science. The graduate program is administered separately from the undergraduate program. Because the State Board of Higher Education has authorized Portland State University to offer Ph.D. programs in only three multidisciplinary fields--urban studies, environmental science, and systems science--it was necessary that the doctoral program be located in one of these three fields. A doctoral program with an emphasis in criminal justice has been developed in urban studies.

The University of Nebraska at Omaha took the first steps toward a criminal-justice-related program in 1962 when the Sociology Department inaugurated a law enforcement program of three courses. At that time the school, known as Omaha University, was a wholly municipally supported institution, not merging into the University of Nebraska system until 1968. In 1965 the program moved out of the Sociology Department and was placed under the College of Continuing Studies, achieving full departmental status as the Department of Law Enforcement and Corrections in 1969. In 1972 a new college--the College of Public Affairs and Community Services--was established on the Omaha campus, and criminal justice and other nondepartmental programs were assigned to this division. It is interesting to note that this series of changes occurred over a relatively short 10-year period of time.

OBJECTIVES AND OBSTACLES

Since both Michigan State University and the University of Maryland had established doctoral programs prior to the receipt of the 406(e) grants, those monies were allocated to strengthening existing programs. However, the two universities expended their funds in somewhat different fashion due to specific objectives developed. Michigan State University devoted the majority of its funds to the establishment of a Criminal Justice Systems Center to strengthen the school's research activities. The focus of these research activities was the involvement of graduate students in applied or problem-solving research in criminal justice agencies. The University of Maryland, on the other hand, used considerable funding to enlarge their faculty and thus the curriculum offerings in the Institute. Funds were provided for five visiting professorships to expand the curriculum in terms of more inclusive coverage of criminal justice subject matter; funds were also provided for three faculty members to be released one-third of their time for research projects. In addition, the University of Maryland grant provided $50,000 for an "international component." No other Consortium institution received funds for developing international activity.

Since the approaches of the two universities were dissimilar, the obstacles they encountered were also quite different. At the inception of the Michigan State University grant, there had been placed a limitation of ten admissions per year into the doctoral program. The University immediately set out to expand the option in criminal justice and criminology and to set an upper limit of 25 admissions. However, considerable controversy arose between the College administration and the School as to the amount of costs that should be allocated to the School, since the students were involved in a broad, interdisciplinary program. The School eventually began a national advertising campaign to recruit the most qualified students. It was not until the fall of 1975 that the maximum allowable enrollment in the Ph.D. program was achieved. This would suggest that students in the master's program were the major source of student research involvement through a large part of the grant program.

The organization and physical locus of the Criminal Justice Systems Center also created obstacles for program success. 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 another building than that housing the office of the School, thus creating a problem with regard to informal communication with both faculty and students. Due to this physical separation, a number of graduate students had only a dim realization of the existence of the Center, and a number of faculty and students perceived the Center as conducting its own business independent of the remainder of the School. The organizational separation between School and Center also created problems in the relationships between Center staff and the regular MSU 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. Due to this lack of communication, the Center was not completely successful in projecting its activities to all the faculty, and its relative lack of visibility resulted in a judgment on the part of some of the faculty that the Center was accomplishing less than it should. This also led to several awkward situations, as in the case where a member of the instructional faculty of the School had prepared a grant application in response to an RFP at the same time that the Center was also preparing a grant response. Even though the faculty was generally informed of the Center's activity via monthly reports at faculty meetings, these reports did not serve sufficiently to inform those faculty not involved with the Center of its activity.

The LEAA fellowships also, in a few instances, created problems for the instructional program. A number of fellowships were awarded to outstanding students at the Ph.D. level who had been serving well as graduate assistants in the instructional program. While the recipients of the fellowships personally benefited greatly from the fellowships, this created the problem of replacing them as graduate assistants.

The University of Maryland had decided to use much of their grant funds for strengthening faculty. Unfortunately, Maryland did not receive approval as a Consortium member until November 1973, placing them four or five months behind the other Consortium institutions in securing personnel and causing them to lose time in planning and developing their activities.

The recruitment of faculty was a difficult obstacle to be overcome at the University of Maryland. Often the assumption is made that, once the money is there, the faculty can be obtained. However, there were certain specific conditions about the Consortium grant which made recruitment especially difficult. The grant, formalized as a three-year grant, provided only for visiting positions, a tremendous handicap in the recruitment of quality academic personnel. Since the grant had not been received until November, it was too late to recruit anybody on a permanent basis beginning with the spring semester. Rarely is a qualified person without a job at that time of the academic year. Thus, most of the recruiting for faculty could not be completed until the second year of the Consortium, which meant recruiting qualified personnel for only two years. Upon hiring, intentions were expressed by the University administration to make every effort to continue at least some of the faculty positions developed under Consortium funding. However, the uncertainty for this final funding still made it extremely difficult to hire high-quality faculty personnel. Because of the general instability in academia and decreases in university budgets, quality faculty are very hesitant to leave tenured positions or positions which promise tenure for temporary positions with some vague hope of becoming permanent, even if these positions offer a higher rank and a higher salary. Recruitment for the third year of the Consortium was especially difficult, since it would be for only a one-year period of time.

There was also a major delay in the securing of secretarial personnel for the program on the basis of funding provided by the Consortium grant. The Personnel Office of the University felt that the salaries provided by the grant were too high in comparison to the functions and qualifications required by the Maryland State Classified Employee System. Thus, considerable delay 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. It was not really until the beginning of the fall semester of 1974 that the clerical situation of the program was reasonably stabilized.

Delays also occurred in the implementation of the international component for which $50,000 had been allocated the University of Maryland grant. However, no further elaboration appeared in the budget. The program narrative stated that the money was earmarked for the development of an international component of the program consisting of comparative criminology in general criminal justice studies in cooperation with appropriate organizations and agencies abroad. It was not until July 1976, near the final completion of Consortium activities, that scheduling of an international conference at the University of Maryland was possible.

The five institutions--Arizona State University, Eastern Kentucky University, Northeastern University, Portland State University, and the University of Nebraska at Omaha--who did not have established doctoral programs at the time of their receipt of the 406(e) grants were in widely varying stages of program development. One university had both undergraduate and master's programs, three had only undergraduate programs, and one had neither a graduate nor an undergraduate program in operation. Although, in a sense, all had the same long-range goal--a doctoral program of some nature--the wide variety of their academic bases at the time of the grant meant that their immediate objectives, and the obstacles met in attempting to reach those objectives, often differed considerably.

Arizona State University was the only Consortium member issued a grant without any previous criminal justice program--graduate or undergraduate. Since the early sixties, 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 came from law enforcement agencies who desired especially a curriculum in police administration; this did not meet with the approval of the academicians at the University, who were very opposed to what they considered such vocational-type programs.

Since the grant was received without any faculty or personnel except the Director, considerable input had to be received from various advisory committees, both on and off the campus. As was typical of some of the other universities, the large grant tended to attract faculty members from other disciplines who served in an advisory capacity but who had little prolonged or intense interest in becoming totally involved in a criminal justice degree program. After a criminal justice faculty was hired, problems arose as to governance policy. Some members of the faculty advisory committee felt 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" and determine academic policy until the new faculty gained sufficient experience to govern themselves. However, it was the unanimous opinion of the faculty that academic tradition dictated that they assume all rights and responsibilities of a faculty and that they must serve as their own governing body.

Another obstacle that developed at Arizona State University pertained to the location of the Center within the academic administrative structure of the University. At the University, all Centers were attached to an academic department within an existing college; however, the Center of Criminal Justice was not attached to any academic unit. This appeared to be of great concern to some members of the academic community. Additional concern was expressed that the Center did not have sufficient experience in operating a baccalaureate program to launch a graduate program. These matters led to problems in getting the master's program approved. Some members of the Graduate Council were concerned as to the Center's administrative location and to the apparent lack of overall administrative and academic experience. Also, the undergraduate program, which had been in operation for only one year, had become extremely popular. Departments that had diminishing numbers of students in their programs were concerned that the development of a master's program in criminal justice would further erode their graduate student enrollment. Thus, numerous obstacles developed from within the Graduate Council. Only after a delay of six months and great expenditure of resources and energy was the program approved. Recruitment of faculty also was further complicated at an institution with a new program having no hard lines and with no history of academic success in the criminal justice field of study.

The contract agreement between Eastern Kentucky University and LEAA was somewhat different from that of the other Consortium institutions. Since Eastern Kentucky University did not have authorization to award doctoral degrees, the agreement pertained only to the development of a joint doctorate with other institutions. Obstacles arose in the effort to develop joint doctorates with the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville. Various conflicts could not be overcome, and the joint doctorate proposals with the institutions in the State of Kentucky were dropped. Joint doctoral programs were developed with Michigan State University and the University of Maryland, but there was still some initial apprehension on the part of candidates to apply for these joint doctoral programs.

Eastern Kentucky University had the same problems as the other schools relative to recruiting personnel on a short-time basis. In the strengthening of the master's program and the development of a joint doctoral progra extensive academic experience was essential, but initially no academic rank was offered. This made positions difficult to fill, and finding appropriate personnel required a great deal of time and effort on the part of the administration.

At Portland State University, a state of considerable uncertainty existed during the first year of the grant. As in most universities, the Portland State University faculty were generally unconcerned when the announcement appeared pertaining to the awarding of LEAA funding. However, a small group of relatively vociferous critics did surface, offering up various allegations that LEAA was an agency involved in "oppression," "repression," and kindred crimes. These objections and claims were even voiced at a Faculty Senate meeting concerned with the criminal justice grant.

Since enrollment had dropped at the University, a number of deans and other officials coveted the 406(e) funds, seeing them as a possibility by means of which some faculty member might be saved from the financial ax. This mad it difficult for the program to employ new personnel. In addition, the lack of involvement of the LEAA Regional Offices in the grant process provided a great deal of concern on the part of both the Regional Office and various local law enforcement agencies. The local law enforcement agencies had anticipated a more narrowly focused program of training in police administration with a much greater applied thrust than what actually evolved.

The second year of the program began with the resignation of the original Project Director. His resignation was due largely to the pressing demands of the undergraduate program over which he had administrative control. A discussion with LEAA provided encouragement for the establishment of the criminal justice program as an area of specialization in the Urban Studies Ph.D. program. The relocation of the project from the undergraduate criminal justice program to the urban studies program created the usual problems that result from a program being transferred at a university. This uncertainty about where the program was to be located, its links, if any, to existing doctoral programs, etc., generated considerable unease until the matter was resolved.

The 406(e) educational development grant at the University of Nebraska at Omaha appeared at a time when there was considerable administrative reorganization throughout the University of Nebraska system. The merger of the old Omaha University with the existing state universities led to the creation of a "systems-level" administration. As a consequence, the related questions of faculty recruitment and retention policies fell under the scrutiny of the Lincoln-based system, leading to a raising of academic criteria on the Omaha campus, which did not--and still does not--have a doctoral level program in operation. In addition, a reorganization within the University brought about the development of a new college, with the criminal justice program being transferred from the College of Continuing Education to the College of Public

Affairs and Community Services. A certain amount of friction accompanied this development, along with the surfacing of differing philosophies between the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Department and the Dean of the College as to the nature of criminal justice education. This eventually led to the replacement of the Chairman, who was also Project Director, in the summer of 1974.

Many complications arose from this conflict between the Department Chairman and the College Dean, resulting in considerable impact on the development of the program. As an example, during the period from March through June of 1974, which would have been the normal time for securing a full graduate level faculty, the University of Nebraska at Omaha Provost instituted a freeze on hiring. The lack of a permanent department chairman during the 1974-75 year also resulted in feelings of uncertainty on the part of the faculty about the future of the department. It was not clear where areas of decision making were located.

Differences also surfaced between the University personnel and LEAA pertaining to the actual development of a doctoral program vis-a-vis the exploration of the possibility of a doctoral program, since the University had no doctoral programs operating on the campus at that time. Because there were no other doctoral programs in operation, there was great concern as to the resources which could be made available for such program development, especially in terms of library facilities and graduate level faculty. At the time of the grant, the undergraduate program at the University of Nebraska at Omaha was basically a vocationally oriented program designed to prepare personnel to enter agency employment. As of mid-July 1974, only one faculty person held a Ph.D. degree and was able to meet the requirements of the graduate program. It was evident that a new emphasis had to be placed on the development of substantive research projects, which would indicate the strong need for the recruitment and selection of new faculty with terminal degrees.

In summary, the objectives of the seven Consortium universities varied considerably and so did the obstacles encountered in meeting those objectives. As one might expect, the obstacles encountered by those institutions developing graduate programs were far greater than those of the two institutions with established doctoral programs whose efforts were devoted to strengthening those programs. Newer institutions may be more receptive to a new bachelor's program, but they are still conservative about graduate programs. The issue of a new doctoral program is a good place for academic purists and conservatives to make their stand. They can argue most cogently that the institution of the university and the development of doctoral studies have taken many centuries and that proposed new doctoral programs need to be thought out over a long period of time. If the major impetus of a new program has been the receipt of a limited-time grant, its opponents within the university may well be encouraged to increase their delaying tactics, assuming that once the grant is ended, the drive for the new program will also end.

The fact that the grants were issued and became operational immediately, leaving very little time for pre-planning, was a common problem for all seven institutions. The offer of grant support was extremely appealing to the universities, many of whom were in a period of severe budgetary crunch due to lower-than-predicted student enrollments. However, universities represent exceedingly complex social organizations, and the introduction of new programs into these systems is not easily achieved unless the changes they represent are based on careful planning. Since no pre-planning period was available, a lag of approximately six months occurred in most institutions before they were staffed with both clerical and professional personnel and were able to proceed with program development.

The determination by LEAA that each Consortium institution should develop a PERT Chart structure and project activities over the three-year span of time of the grants presented another difficulty. As the complications inherent in monitoring the grants by this method became apparent. the demand for following such rigid schedules was quietly dropped by the funding agency. Nevertheless, attempts to comply with this request pointed up some of the complexities of the university and some of the bureaucratic mazes that must be negotiated in developing new programs. University decision making just does not lend itself to rigid timetables and the bureaucratic orderliness anticipated by the federal government.

The recruitment and retention of personnel was a problem for all seven institutions. Even Michigan State University and the University of Maryland, with their established criminal justice programs, experienced problems in obtaining high quality faculty, particularly graduate faculty, for a short period of time. As one might expect, these problems were even more severe for the other five institutions. The lack of assurance that a doctoral program would finally materialize complicated this already difficult situation in faculty recruitment. In addition, it was necessary for the institutions to recruit new doctoral faculty personnel, since most of their undergraduate faculties were staffed with personnel without terminal degrees. In fact, two of the institutions receiving grants had personnel without terminal degrees as directors of their respective 406(e) projects.

Another obstacle to the development of doctoral programs at the five institutions appeared to result from the turnover of personnel who were given authority to direct the 406(e) grants, as well as administrative changes at the top level of the universities during the time that the grants were in operation. Of the five institutions, there were three changes in Project Director during the grant period, in addition to numerous changes of Research Directors.

In short, the major obstacles at all seven universities would appear to be typical problems that evolve between universities and granting agencies when goals and objectives must be met within a limited time span. Recruitment of quality personnel for a short period of time and the integration of personnel into existing projects and programs often create friction and barriers in institutions that are noted for being slow-moving due to the many committees and advisory groups that are involved in the decision-making process. The availability of adequate physical space to house such programs without sufficient time for planning also adds to the difficulty. It appears, too, that the larger the university, the more essential it is to receive input not only from major elements within the university but also from governing boards, other higher education institutions within the state or area, and state and regional LEAA planning agencies, all of whom could be affected by major program changes.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

As the objectives and obstacles of the seven Consortium universities varied widely, so do the accomplishments. The two universities with established doctoral programs--Michigan State University and the University of Maryland--not only strengthened their doctoral programs but also made extensive changes in their master's programs which provided greater scope, richness, and depth to curricular offerings. Michigan State University extensively revised its Master of Science degree program and provided for changes in the undergraduate program which exposed students to a broad view of the total criminal justice system. The University of Maryland increased the number of course offerings from 15 in 1973 to 24 in 1976, and their proposal included a professional position for the recruitment of graduate minority students.

There was also considerable progress in developing the research components of the programs, with both institutions receiving additional research grants. Additional opportunities developed for students in applied research areas, with strengthened supervision from faculty and staff. The grants also provided for increases in graduate research assistants and fellowship positions.

Finally, the Consortium grants allowed for the expansion in the number of students enrolled in the various programs, as well as the development of additional hard-line positions at the universities. Michigan State University increased the number of students enrolled in their doctoral program from 10 to 25, while master's level enrollment increased from 89 in 1973 to 125 in 1975. Two new hard-line positions were given to the School. At the University of Maryland, the number of Ph.D. students grew from 0 in 1973 to 24 in the fall of 1976, and the number of master's degree students reached a total of 53 in 1976, compared to 38 in the fall of 1973. Additionally, the University of Maryland received five new state-funded faculty budget lines. The increase in positions indicates approval of the strengthened curriculum and a continuous resource commitment by the universities for the future.

Largely because there was such a wide range in the strength of the academic bases of the five Consortium universities who did not have established doctoral programs at the time of the grants, there is also great variety in their present status. Arizona State University had neither a graduate nor an undergraduate program; it now has both. Eastern Kentucky University had a master's program in operation; it now also has joint doctoral programs with other universities. Northeastern University, Portland State University, and the University of Nebraska at Omaha had undergraduate, but no graduate, programs. All three now have master's programs; Northeastern has a Ph.D. in Forensic Chemistry, and Portland State has a Ph.D. in Urban Studies with specialization in criminal justice. Although only two doctoral programs plus a joint doctorate emerged from the five institutions, there remain strong possibilities for doctoral programs to be developed at the other two universities within the next few years. Since, at the time of grant origin, there was only one master's program in criminal justice among the five universities, considerable time and effort were expended in the development of master's programs, which in most universities serve as the basic foundation for doctoral program development.

Perhaps the greatest achievement of the five universities was the development of research potential for graduate students and faculty as well as the development of numerous programs and activities pertaining to technology transfer. Since most of the colleges or departments had not previously been involved in a large amount of research activity or the transfer of information with local, state, and regional criminal justice agencies, there developed a fertile atmosphere for such activities. Many of these criminal justice agencies were located in geographical areas that in the past had had limited opportunities to develop applied research projects in cooperation with criminal justice faculties and graduate students. They now indicated to the universities their needs pertaining to the transfer of new research, ideas, and activities related to the improvement of the criminal justice system. Numerous workshops, advisory groups, public service projects, symposia, consultive assistance, and publications were developed as a means of facilitating this technology transfer.

The grants provided for program expansion not only in quality but quantity as well. For example, by the fall of 1975 Portland State University had five candidates admitted to its doctoral program, Northeastern University has already awarded Master of Science degrees in Criminal Justice to 39 students, Arizona State University has admitted 227 students to the Master of Science program and has had 21 students graduate in the master's program.

The addition of faculty hard lines at the various institutions has also increased to a considerable extent. Arizona State University has had an increase from 0 funds allocated to the Center in 1973 to a present state budget of $216,000. This budget has funded eight hard lines. Portland State University has approximately $57,000 added for their new doctoral program. Several of the other institutions have indicated that they will be receiving additional hard lines but that they had not been finalized as of this writing.

CHAPTER 5. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS

The grants to the individual institutions specified evaluation as one of the requirements to be met. Consequently, from the earliest beginnings of the grant period, evaluation was a matter of great interest to all members of the Consortium and was frequently a subject of discussion at Consortium meetings. Early in the development of the Consortium, thinking persisted that the use of PERT (Program Evaluation and Review Technique) Charts might facilitate any evaluation activity, be it internal or external. PERT was designed to function as "a manager's tool for defining and coordinating what must be done to successfully accomplish the objectives of a project on time" (Federal Electric Corporation, p. 1). However, at a later date the utility of the PERT Chart concept was questioned as it became apparent that this was not an adequate tool for evaluating program success. A decision to abandon PERT was based on recognition of the complexity of universities and their difficulty in meeting deadlines due to involvement of faculty members, administrative personnel, advisory groups, and others.

Soon after the formation of the Office of the Coordinator, it was also suggested that the Coordinator, along with the LEAA Program Manager, might provide a monitoring service to the Chairman and members of the Consortium Board. Upon consideration, however, the general opinion was expressed that the Coordinator should not be a "watchdog" for evaluation of the Consortium institutions but instead should serve as a facilitator of their various activities.

Another subject of much discussion was evaluation by a third party--whether this was necessary and, if so, who the third party should be and the extent or breadth of the evaluation. It was suggested that an evaluation might appropriately be made by a reputable academic accrediting association. This idea was discarded when it was pointed out that, because criminal justice is such a new area of study in higher education, most such organizations would lack the expertise to be able to evaluate graduate criminal justice programs. At that time, LEAA officials indicated that there definitely would be a third-party evaluation and that a request for proposals was being distributed for a grant to be awarded for this particular purpose. This did not materialize, however, and it was pointed out that evaluation by a third party was not a requirement of LEAA. It was decided, therefore, that no further action regarding an outside evaluation would be taken by the Board of Directors, although it was encouraged for the individual institutions.

In December 1974 the issue of outside evaluation was again raised. Word was received by the Board of Directors that LEAA planned an outside evaluation at approximately the midpoint of the grant period. The purpose of this evaluation was to determine if progress was being made toward achievement of the goals of the Consortium grants and if those goals would be met by the termination date. To help prepare the institutions, a preliminary model for evaluation was adapted by the Coordinator and Robert Ullman of Eastern Kentucky University and distributed to each Project Director for use in gathering pertinent data to be made available to the evaluator. In April 1975 these midpoint evaluations were conducted by PRC/Public Management Services, Inc., which served as a consulting and information firm for LEAA. Seven criminal justice educators or administrators were selected, each of whom visited one Consortium university and submitted an individual report to LEAA. An eighth evaluator prepared a summary report relating to the individual schools and the Consortium as a whole. For many of the institutions, these reports not only provided for an evaluation of past activities but also served to give direction and pinpoint activities to be continued for the remainder of the grant period. A similar evaluation was conducted in August 1976 prior to the termination of the grants.

In retrospect, it becomes evident that the Consortium was concerned with three phases of evaluation: individual self-evaluation, evaluation of the Consortium as a whole, and a third-party evaluation. Each of these phases posed different problems and required special attention. Many meetings were held and discussions devoted to the concern for adequate and meaningful evaluation. The reluctance to agree upon an appropriate method certainly indicates the extreme difficulty involved in an attempt to evaluate the products of something as complex as a large university. The many forces acting and the many products resulting from a university defy being measured, especially in a period of time as limited as the Consortium grants. The important products of the Consortium--its students and their effect upon the criminal justice system--cannot possibly be measured for many years to come. For this reason, the concept of this multi-volume final report of the activities of the seven universities and of the Consortium as a whole was developed and implemented. Self-evaluations of the individual programs, written by the Project Directors, are reproduced below. A Summary Evaluation follows in Chapter 6.

SELF-EVALUATIONS OF THE CONSORTIUM UNIVERSITIES*

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY SELF-EVALUATION

DEVELOPMENT OF GRADUATE CURRICULUM IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The development of the Master of Science in Criminal Justice curriculum started immediately after the award of the grant on July 1, 1973. A proposal was submitted to the Graduate Council in March 1974, returned to the Center by the Graduate Council in May 1974, and rewritten during the summer of 1974. The proposal was resubmitted to the Graduate Council in August 1974, passed by the Graduate Council in September, and approved by the Faculty Senate in November 1974. The proposal was transmitted to the Board of Regents in November and approved by the Board on December 21, 1974. Classes were initiated the following January. It is anticipated that a doctoral proposal will be submitted to the Graduate Council in the fall of 1976 or the spring of 1977.

ACADEMIC PRODUCTION

A total of 227 students were admitted to the Master of Science program between January 1974 and June 1976; as of May 1976, 21 students had graduated with a Master of Science in

*These self-evaluations were provided by the Project Directors of the seven Consortium schools:
Arizona State University, I. Gayle Shuman
Eastern Kentucky University, James W. Fox
Michigan State University, John H. McNamara
Northeastern University, Norman Rosenblatt
Portland State University, Don C. Gibbons
University of Maryland, Peter P. Lejins
University of Nebraska at Omaha, Vincent J. Webb

Criminal Justice. Although no students have been admitted to the doctoral program, there are currently several students with Juris Doctorates and master's degrees admitted to and taking classes in the master's program, awaiting approval of the doctoral program. These students are considered to be in a "holding" pattern for the doctoral program and will serve as a pool of prospective applicants.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

During the three years of this project, the Center disseminated 32 separate documents to 19 other institutions of higher education in Arizona (2 state universities, 16 community colleges, and 1 private college) and the governing boards of the universities and community colleges. The documents included copies of major research papers prepared by the Center and other Consortium schools, plus other documents not readily available to the institutions involved. Selected research documents were also disseminated to functional criminal justice agencies throughout the state. These documents were restricted to the research publications of the Center and other Consortium schools.

FACULTY AND STUDENT EXCHANGE

During the spring semester of 1976, Professor Don Gibbons of Portland State University taught a regularly scheduled graduate seminar on the campus of Arizona State University. During the winter quarter of 1976, Ms. Sandra Wallace, a regularly admitted student to the graduate program at Arizona State

University, earned 10 quarter hours of credit at Northeastern University. All 10 quarter hours were transferrable to Arizona State University and are a part of her approved program of studies. This exchange was a joint venture among Arizona State University, Northeastern University, and the Arizona Department of Public Safety where Ms. Wallace is employed in the crime laboratory.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Most of the research efforts of the Center's faculty and staff have been directed to the development of the master's and doctoral curricula. However, the Center did produce three major research documents: The Problem of Crime in Arizona--How Do We Solve It? was published by the Arizona Academy and reflected the research the Center had conducted for the 27th Annual Town Hall; An Assessment of the Attitudes of Criminal Justice Personnel in Arizona Regarding Higher Education was a major research effort conducted by the Center and the College of Business Administration; Criminal Justice: A Multi-Disciplinary Bibliography was a joint effort by the Center and Portland State University. Of the 21 students who completed the requirements for Master of Science in Criminal Justice, 7 elected to write a thesis as a part of their graduate program. A list of students and their thesis titles follows:

Dennis A. Holley, An Evaluation of a Police Human Services Specialist Community Liaison Program.

Patricia H. Knox, Efficacy of Assertive Training in Changing Locus of Control.

William B. Cooper, Juvenile Delinquency Among Ethnic Minorities.

Leopold Ackerman, II, Diversionary Programs in the Criminal Justice System: New Ideas in Conflict with Traditional Legal Issues.

Victor H. Sims, Manpower Characteristics of Arizona's Small Police Departments.

Christine M. Horylev, The Deterrent Effectiveness of Mandatory Sentencing.

Joseph Garcia, A Model for Automated Searches of Latent Palmprints.

The Center's faculty and staff have been actively involved in manpower development and evaluation projects of local criminal justice agencies. Most of these activities have been related to program evaluation and were conducted in order to (1) develop expertise in evaluation among the Center's faculty and staff, (2) expose graduate students to evaluation studies, (3) develop a degree of trust between the criminal justice agencies and the Center of Criminal Justice, and (4) provide an important community service not now available to criminal justice agencies in Maricopa County. Projects involved included a citizen's support and participation project with the city of Glendale, an adult diversion program with the city of Tempe, the effectiveness of juvenile probation officers in high schools for the Maricopa County Juvenile Court Center, a community service program and team policing with the city of Scottsdale, a study of the reliability of the sentencing recommendations of adult probation officers with the Maricopa County Adult Probation Office, the development of a design for assigning clients to a new diagnostic program or a traditional program at the state juvenile

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

institution with the Arizona Department of Corrections, a survey of all community organizations in Maricopa County as to their perceived relationship to the criminal justice system, and a crime analysis program with the Psychology Department and the city of Scottsdale involving the plotting and characteristics of all burglaries and grand thefts in Scottsdale.

The Center has also developed two major research proposals involving manpower development that are currently being reviewed by potential funding agencies. In June 1976 the Center obtained a copy of the four computer tapes containing the raw data of Project STAR. These data will be used for research projects by the faculty and graduate students. Analysis of several models of juror decision making will be presented at the American Psychological Convention on September 6, 1976, and submitted for publication. Also, all evaluations of programs dealing with juvenile delinquency in Maricopa County will be compiled and analyzed. A general evaluation model will be developed to measure the effectiveness of the juvenile justice system in Maricopa County.

HARD LINES DEVELOPED

At the inception of this grant, the University had no state monies assigned to the criminal justice program. At the completion of the grant, the University had in excess of $216,000 assigned to the Center of Criminal Justice for fiscal year 1976-77. These funds support eight full-time faculty, two part-time faculty, two full-time secretaries, plus necessary supplies, etc. In addition, out of non-appropriated funds, the University has funded a half-time coordinator of student advisement and a half-time coordinator of administrative services. Only one full-time secretary and three graduate students were not absorbed by the University at the completion of the grant.

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY SELF-EVALUATION

The 406(e) Educational Development 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 time span for this project was three years, from July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1976, with an extension of three months granted through 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 listed in the grant: (1) graduate program development, (2) faculty and student exchange, (3) manpower and related research projects, and (4) research related to curriculum and instructional improvement.

An additional objective was urged upon the project by the Program Manager; this was the objective of technology transfer. A sixth objective was first encouraged and then not funded by LEAA; this was the objective of developing an international criminal justice research component. Each of these objectives had its own impact upon the criminal justice education program at Eastern Kentucky University and, through this program, upon other elements in the University, as well as 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. These objectives, however, are not terminal in nature. That is, in each case the objective was to set in motion a process--whether that process be 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, very likely represents the greatest progress made through the 406(e) grant project. The manpower research objective comes a close second in this level of accomplishment. One may say that these two objectives were clearly accomplished, though from the perspective of those involved in the project these will be continuous efforts that will need continual support and activity. Other research projects directed toward curriculum and instruction improvement may also be said to have been accomplished, though the stages of development in this objective are also continuous and will need increased efforts on the part of our personnel at Eastern Kentucky University, College of Law Enforcement, 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 by 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, Region IV, in which we are located. A member of the Center staff is presently 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 greatest leeway for political influence in the criminal justice system. Thus, this new direction could provide an emphasis upon professionalism while deemphasizing the influence of patronage in the criminal justice system, an objective which is implicit in the development of graduate higher education for criminal justice personnel.

The new directions provided by research and conferences may also have considerable significance for criminal justice higher education. The Conference on Court Administration, the Conference on Women in Criminal Justice, and the Conference on Privacy and Data Systems which were conducted on this campus are examples of a new direction. The conferences focused upon the evaluation of alternative educational or administrative programs for the criminal justice system in our region and provided the substance for the systematic design of graduate educational programs. Other research--including comparative criminal justice systems, value consistency in the criminal justice system, and victimization--provides the substance for new direction in curriculum, in research, and in service to our constituents.

The student-faculty exchange program in itself is a new direction in higher education. While 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 upon which this new direction can be built.

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 upon 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.

Research projects at Eastern Kentucky under the grant have been organized under the "mini-grant" program, whereby the faculty member was required to submit a proposal which was reviewed before the award was made. A monitor of the mini-grant was assigned by the Center Director, and a separate budget line was established if the grant was awarded. The primary considerations in the award of grants were: (1) improvement of research input to our graduate courses, (2) enrichment of our present body of knowledge, (3) opportunities to upgrade the faculty in criminal justice and related areas, (4) the professional level of the research design, (5) reasonable budget limits, and (6) the promise of a product from research. Since Eastern began the grant period with little or no previous research production, this area was accurately viewed as a pump-priming effort which was of great importance to the College. Projects completed under this program are reviewed in Volume I of this Report.

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, this project has enabled the University to identify new directions for development academically and for service to the criminal justice system.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY SELF-EVALUATION

REVISION AND EXPANSION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

The Social Science Ph.D. with the option in Criminal Justice and Criminology had been jointly offered by the School of Criminal Justice and the College of Social Science since 1969. The Educational Development Grant allowed for the expansion of the number of students enrolled in the program from 10 to 25. Not until the 1975-76 school year, however, was that number of qualified students enrolled in the program. The future size of the program is expected to be 20 full-time students.

The Master of Science degree program in the School was extensively revised along with the undergraduate curriculum. The undergraduate curriculum changed from one in which students enrolled in "tracks"--such as law enforcement, corrections, delinquency, and the like--to a "generalist" curriculum with students no longer in tracks but exposed to a broad view of the total criminal justice system. The curriculum change was accompanied by a reduction in the number of undergraduate courses offered by the School. This followed from a faculty resolution in 1972 to place approximately half of the faculty resources in the graduate programs.

The master's curriculum designed prior to and during the grant was first implemented in the winter quarter of 1975. It is one which has a number of specific concentrations. The former undergraduate track system was used broadly as a model to construct the following concentrations: police administration, correctional administration, delinquency prevention and control, research and planning, criminal justice education, forensic science, and security administration. The concentrations are aimed at preparing students for administrative or technical positions in the field of criminal justice and are considered much more analytic than the former track system. The curriculum also includes courses of a more general nature and, in conjunction with the courses from the separate concentrations, can be used as preparation for doctoral studies. All the courses in the master's curriculum also serve the present doctoral students.

STUDENT ENROLLMENTS AND DEGREES GRANTED

During the period of the grant, the undergraduate fall quarter enrollments were 707 in 1973, 712 in 1974, and 855 in 1975. Fall quarter enrollments at the master's level were 89 in 1973, 87 in 1974, and 125 in 1975. Fall quarter enrollments in the Ph.D. program were 6 in 1973, 13 in 1974, and 20 in 1975. It is anticipated that Ph.D. enrollments in the fall quarter 1976 will be 23. (See the MSU program history in Volume I for preceding years.)

The degrees awarded during the grant period for each fiscal year are as follows: for the undergraduate program, 280 in 1974, 284 in 1975, and 260 in 1976; at the master's level, 36 in 1974, 33 in 1975, and 35 in 1976; at the Ph.D. level, 1 in 1974, 2 in 1975, and 2 in 1976.

LEAA GRADUATE RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

From a dollar amount of $97,785 varying levels of fellowship funding were awarded to a total of 31 students over the period of the grant to the School. It is anticipated that nine more students will be awarded doctoral dissertation research fellowships in the near future. The fellowships were used to support thesis and dissertation research at the master's and Ph.D. levels. A few exceptional students were also awarded stipends for doctoral studies. Some fellowships were awarded to students outside the School who were conducting crime or criminal-justice-related dissertation research. Some other fellowships were used to support research interns in a wide variety of criminal justice agencies. Seven master's theses and seven doctoral dissertations were completed with assistance from fellowship funds. Five doctoral dissertations are nearing completion as of the summer of 1976.

ADDITIONAL GRANTS RECEIVED DURING THE PERIOD OF THE GRANT

Model Evaluation Program ($190,000): This is a contract with the Michigan State Planning Agency to conduct two intensive evaluations in the program areas of Youth Service Bureaus and Specialized Police Units (December 1, 1975 - June 30, 1977).

Michigan Law Enforcement Training Council Graduate Assistantships ($22,500): These fellowships supported five graduate research interns from the School in research into various topics relating to police training (October 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976).

LEAA Training Workshops ($32,900): These funds were awarded from LEAA Regional Office V to support the design and implementation of two workshops on (a) Planning and Evaluation and (b) Alternatives to Prison Overcrowding (July 1, 1975 - December 31, 1976).

LEAA Internships ($41,511): These funds were used to support students in the Criminal Justice "Practicum" (July 1, 1973 - August 31, 1976).

Criminal Justice Teaching Fellowships ($36,000): These funds were awarded by the U. S. Office of Education to support six master's and Ph.D. level students who completed a program of study in the Criminal Justice Education concentration. Each fellow developed and offered a course in the Wayne County Community College System in the Detroit area (September 1, 1974 - August 30, 1975).

Criminal Justice Curriculum Institute ($20,000): Funds from the U. S. Office of Education were awarded to conduct a two-week intensive summer workshop for approximately 20 community college educators. The end product is anticipated to be a model associate degree curriculum with emphasis on the systemic level of criminal justice (Summer 1976).

Preliminary Assessment of Female Troopers in the Michigan State Police ($7,000): A contract with the State Police was awarded to the School to design a systematic study of female troopers to be implemented when their numbers are sufficiently large to justify such a study (July 15, 1976 - December 15, 1976).

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

As indicated in the MSU program history in Volume I, the research efforts undertaken with funding from the Educational Development Grant were conceived as having a strong educational --an experiential learning--component as well as a technology transfer component for the agencies in which the research was conducted. Projects were conceptualized as being of two sorts: long-range projects in which a number of graduate students could be involved either as individuals or as members of a given class, and shorter range projects of a delimited nature in which one or more students would conduct specific research for an operational or planning agency.

Examples of the long-range type of study are the Wayne County Sheriff's Department policy development project, the female offenders project with the Michigan Department of Corrections, women in policing in Michigan, the development of a computerized criminal justice data bank, and a follow-up study of all graduates of the School between 1938 and 1973.

A number of short-range projects were conducted. Notable among these are studies done by research interns funded by fellowship money. As indicated in Volume I, an intensive research internship program was initiated in the summer of 1975 which involved 15 graduate students in 13 different projects in a total of 11 separate agencies. These and other student research interns were supervised by the staff of the Criminal Justice Systems Center, and the students' and the agencies' experiences are presently being evaluated.

Graduate research assistants also produced the following bibliographies: Crime Prevention, Female Offenders, The Effects of Higher Education on Criminal Justice Personnel, Criminal Justice Planning and Research, and Criminal Justice Evaluation.

Additionally, the Center's staff produced the following grant applications which have not been funded as yet: Computer Analysis and Interpretation of Job Stress in Police Officers, Model Program for Integrating Curriculum Design with Employment Market Data, Michigan State Planning Agency Manpower Development Plan, and a Phase One Evaluation of Coed Correctional Institutions.

A number of concept papers were also produced by staff of the Center and include the following: Wayne County Sheriff's Department Collaborative-Developmental Action Research Project, National LEEP Evaluation, A Proposal for the Development of a Prescriptive Package in Criminal Justice Education, Orientation Seminars on Issues and Problems for Women in Criminal Justice, and a proposed Adjunct Research Center for the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training.

MISCELLANEOUS

The grant allowed for more interaction with students and faculty from other disciplines at MSU than had previously been the case.

During the grant, two new hard-line positions were given to the School. This brought the total to 17 FTEF. Three faculty members were fully supported by grant funds and one by release funds from salary paid by the grant during its duration. Some additional summer appointments were paid for by the grant.

The Dean of the College of Social Science has committed money to the partial support of the Criminal Justice Systems Center for the next year.

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY SELF-EVALUATION

PREFACE

The 406(e) Educational Development Grant at Northeastern University is divided into two segments that on the one hand are separate from each other and yet on the other hand are closely intertwined. They are the Master of Science program in Criminal Justice and the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy programs in Forensic Chemistry. The former program concentrates on behavioral science theory, methodology, and administration in criminal justice while the latter is heavily weighted in the area of instrumentation and research in the chemical sciences.

How are such seemingly divergent programs related? The programs are intertwined by the fact that students in Criminal Justice and in Forensic Chemistry must fulfill their basic criminal justice courses together in the College. In addition, both programs are administered by the College, and the Criminal Justice faculty must vote the degrees for students in both programs.

Both programs were implemented well before the expiration of the LEAA grant; the Master of Science program was operational in September of 1973, the Master of Science in Forensic Chemistry was in operation in September of 1975, and the Ph.D. program in Forensic Chemistry admitted its first students in December of 1975.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Upon receipt of the Educational Development Grant, Northeastern University created the Institute of Chemical Analysis, Applications and Forensic Science under the direction of Barry L. Karger and allotted laboratory and office space for its use in a new building that was completed in the summer of 1974.

The role of the Institute and its staff was twofold: to carry out research activities in the field of Forensic Chemistry and related areas and to organize a graduate program in Forensic Chemistry in conjunction with the faculty of the College of Criminal Justice. The need for a viable research program was based upon the projected Ph.D. program.

The faculty and staff of the Institute spent the academic year 1973-74 organizing the laboratory facilities and by the spring of 1974, with the laboratory in place, research activities began. A list of the published results and submitted research monographs of the Institute follows:

D. E. Polk and B. C. Giessen, "A New Serial Number Marking System Applicable to Firearms Identification," Journal of Forensic Sciences, 20, 501 (1975).

B. L. Karger, J. M. Parker, B. C. Giessen, and G. Davies, "Graduate Education and Research in Forensic Chemistry at Northeastern University," in Education and Scientific Progress in Forensic Science, G. Davies (ed.), ACS Symposium Series, 1975.

B. C. Giessen, D. E. Polk, and J. A. W. Barnard, "The Application of Materials Science Methods to Forensic Problems: Principles, Serial Number Recovery and Paper Identification," in Education and Scientific Progress in Forensic Science, G. Davies (ed.), ACS Symposium Series, 1975.

G. Davies, "Educational and Scientific Progress in Criminalistics," Analytical Chemistry, Vol. 47, No. 3, March 1975, pp. 318A-330A.

J. A. W. Barnard, D. E. Polk, and B. C. Giessen, "Forensic Identification of Papers by Elemental Analysis Using Scanning Electron Microscopy," Scanning Electron Microscopy/ 1975 (Part II), ITT Research Institute, April 1975, pp. 519-527.

G. Davies (ed.), Education and Scientific Progress in Forensic Science, ACS Symposium Series, 1975.

D. E. Polk and B. C. Giessen, "Metallurgical Aspects of Serial Number Recovery," AFTE Journal, 7(2), 38 (1975).

B. A. Petersen, P. Vouros, J. M. Parker, and B. L. Karger, "Mass Spectrometry as an Aid in the Detection and Identification of Piperidyl Benzilates and Related Glycolates," Journal of Forensic Sciences, 21, 279 (1976).

P. Vouros, B. Petersen, W. P. Daffeldecker, and J. L. Neumeyer, "Aporphines 19. Mass Spectrometry of Benzylisoquinolines. Influence of Stereochemistry on Fragmentation and Evidence for an Ionically Induced Intramolecular Migration Process," submitted to Journal of Organic Chemistry.

L. F. Colwell and B. L. Karger, "Ink Identification by High Performance Liquid Chromatography."

R. T. Felix, T. Boenisch, and R. W. Giese, "Haptoglobin Phenotyping of Bloodstains by Nongradient Polyacrylamide Electrophoresis," submitted to Journal of Forensic Sciences.

J. C. Barrick, D. E. Polk, R. V. Raman, and B. C. Giessen, "Forensic Applications of X-Ray Diffraction. I. Differentiation of Piperidyl Benzilates and Related Glycolates by Micro-X-Ray Diffraction."

D. E. Polk, A. E. Attard, and B. C. Giessen, "Forensic Characterization of Papers II: Determination of Batch Differences by SEM Elemental Analysis of the Inorganic Components," submitted to Journal of Forensic Sciences.

P. Vouros and D. A. Marshal, "Mass Spectrometric Sensitivity Data for Selected Compounds of Biological and Forensic Interest."

J. A. W. Barnard, A. Halpern, and B. C. Giessen, "Forensic Characterization of Paper III: UV Luminescence," to be submitted to Journal of Organic Chemistry.

As of this writing, research activities are continuing in the areas of Liquid Chromatography in Toxicology, Ink Analysis by Liquid Chromatography, Mass Spectrometry of Drugs, Bloodstain Methodology, Arson Accelerants by Liquid Chromatography and Piperidyl Benzilates Esters, Identification by Mass Spectrometry.

The research accomplishments of the Institute are highly regarded by the University and the academic community and, thus, Northeastern University has assumed complete support for its activities now that the Educational Development Grant has ended. This support not only includes funds for faculty and staff positions and laboratory facilities but also teaching assistantships for graduate students.

ACADEMIC PRODUCTION

As of September 1976, 39 students have already received their Master of Science in Criminal Justice degrees, while the number of students enrolled in the master's program in Forensic Chemistry is 11, with one candidate scheduled to complete his requirements for the Ph.D. in Forensic Chemistry by January of 1978. It is noteworthy that all master's students in both programs must produce a research monograph or thesis as part of the requirements for their degrees. The research activity being conducted by the Ph.D. candidate is in the area of X-ray diffraction of products obtained in crystal tests performed on suspected controlled substances (drugs). All students in the graduate program in Forensic Chemistry must spend at least one academic quarter as interns in forensic laboratories and without exception their internships were and/or are in municipal, state, or federal agencies.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

A major focus of the criminal justice program at Northeastern University is technology transfer. To accomplish this, the College of Criminal Justice established very close working relationships with the Boston Police Laboratory that were and are mutually helpful and beneficial. In addition, staff members from the Institute assisted various law enforcement agencies in investigations they were conducting, especially in the area of fire, arson, and explosives. Enforcement officials and federal agency scientists visited the Institute laboratories to carry out scientific inquiries according to the methodologies and techniques developed by the Forensic Chemistry staff. In addition, FDA workshops, papers, and/or talks were presented to many professional groups during the years of the grant. A list of these presentations follows:

During the initial grant phases, trips were taken to various state and county crime laboratories; a complete list is in the "Combined Quarterly Reports of the LEAA Educational Development Grant--April-September 1974."

"Forensic Identification of Papers by Elemental Analysis Using SEM" by Barnard, Polk, and Giessen, Eighth Annual Scanning Electron Microscopy Symposium, April 10-11, 1975, St. Louis, Mo.

Colloquium--"The Criminal Justice System in Our Society--Bridging the Justice Gap."

"Metallurgical Aspects of Serial Number Recovery" by Polk, Annual Meeting of the Association of Firearm and Tool Mark Examiners, April 1975.

"Forensic Materials Science Research at Northeastern University" by Giessen, March 28, 1975, Aerospace Corp., California.

"Physical and Trace Evidence--Collection and Analysis" by Parker, January 16, 1975, Allegheny County Coroner's Office.

"Advances in Criminalistics: Forensic Chemistry and Materials Science" by Giessen, at Boston Section, AIME, May 3, 1976.

Keynote address by Barry Karger at Forensic Science Section of Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, D. C., November 1975.

"Forensic Materials Science" by Giessen, M.I.T., November 1975.

Four reports at American Academy of Forensic Science, February 1976.

Paul Vorous chaired a symposium on "Forensic Applications of Mass Spectrometry," San Diego meeting of American Society of Mass Spectrometry. (This was the first symposium of its kind.)

The faculty of the College of Criminal Justice also participated in an extensive number of public services projects. For example, the Task Forces on Standards and Goals in Massachusetts included Dean Norman Rosenblatt, Professor Edith Flynn, and Professor James Reed. The latter two faculty members were also very actively involved in study committees on prisons in Massachusetts. A colloquium was sponsored by the College in 1974-75, while in 1976 the Community Criminal Justice Forum was created to bring community and college together on issues of criminal justice. The Second International Symposium on Victimology was also hosted by the College in September of 1976; 300 foreign and American participants exchanged information and presented papers dealing with the victims of crimes. The faculty of the College also play a significant role in the Massachusetts Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences as well as in national professional societies in establishing standards in criminal justice higher education and accreditation. In conclusion, the faculty and staff of the Institute of Chemical Analysis, Applications and Forensic Science as well as the faculty of the College of Criminal Justice are actively involved on the local, regional, national, and international levels in expanding the horizons of knowledge of criminal justice.

DEVELOPMENT OF GRADUATE CURRICULUM IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

During 1973-74, preliminary work was carried out on curriculum development. During 1974-75, a curriculum subcommittee (chaired by Don Gibbons) developed a field-area specialization in criminal justice within the Urban Studies doctoral program at Portland State University. That curriculum was approved by the Urban Studies curriculum committee, the Urban Studies faculty, the Graduate Council of the University, and the University Senate during 1974-75. Finally, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education approved the curriculum in December 1975 and authorized the University to inaugurate the criminal justice graduate program, effective winter term 1976. Accordingly, the development of a Ph.D. and master's program in criminal justice has been accomplished and implemented, six months before the expiration of the LEAA grant. The curriculum in criminal justice is described in detail in the Portland State University program history in Volume I and in other documents produced by the program.

ACADEMIC PRODUCTION

One doctoral candidate in criminal justice, Michael Wiatrowski, was admitted to the program beginning fall 1974. Four doctoral candidates (Kathryn Farr, Richard Whipple, Richard Piland, and James White) were admitted to the doctoral program beginning fall 1975. Additionally, several other Urban Studies Ph.D. and M.U.S. candidates have indicated interest in a criminal justice specialization. Graduate Research Fellowships were awarded for 1975-76 to Wiatrowski, Farr, Piland, White, and also to David Johnson and Priscilla Kimboko. Bradley Post is currently working on a Master of Urban Studies degree, with concentration in criminal justice. We anticipate that four to six new Ph.D. candidates will be admitted to the criminal justice program starting fall 1976.

The undergraduate Administration of Justice program at Portland State University is administratively separate from the graduate program, being lodged in the College of Social Science. However, the University is currently engaged in discussions leading to the establishment of a School of Urban Affairs. In all likelihood, the undergraduate and graduate programs in criminal justice will ultimately be located in that School, with some greater degree of administrative coordination of the programs resulting from that change.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Two kinds of research work were conducted during the period of the project. First, a series of studies was carried out by project research associates, producing data and materials of various kinds that are related directly to curriculum development and implementation. These studies included an investigation of LEEP loan recipients, a regional manpower and educational needs assessment, an investigation of field placement opportunities, and a review and assessment of research models and curriculum needs in criminal justice. Additionally, project research associates produced annotated bibliographies on economic analyses of crime, criminal justice program evaluation, diversion programs, the impact of divorce experiences on children, and racial factors in crime. These bibliographies are to be utilized in the graduate offerings in the program. Some of them have also been disseminated to criminal justice educators and practitioners. The project research associates also conducted research studies, evaluating the Parrott Creek Ranch for Boys and Hillcrest School in Oregon. One research associate is currently involved in producing a bibliography and other materials on criminal justice planning needs, practices, and principles.

One activity meriting special attention has to do with appointment of Joseph Thimm as lecturer in the program for 1975-76. Mr. Thimm is a top administrator from the Children's Services Division of the State of Oregon. He is engaged in teaching courses in criminal justice programming and planning. However, much of his time was devoted to the development of curriculum materials and publishable materials in criminal justice planning. His activities are designed to address a major lacuna in the criminal justice literature.

The second kind of research sponsored by the project involved a number of studies carried out by faculty members. These criminal justice research projects were designed to: (1) produce criminal justice research findings and (2) contribute to faculty development, producing faculty members with enhanced interest and competence in criminal justice investigation.

This second group of studies includes an investigation of divorce, parenting styles, and consequences upon children in the way of delinquency and other behavior problems. That study extended from fall 1974 to June 1976. Additionally, the project funded the following faculty research endeavors:

A study of police and citizen views of police behavior in the North Precinct of Portland.

A study of aging processes among convicts.

A study of gun discharge residues and trace metal analysis.

A study of the use of innovative physical education techniques in dealing with delinquent youths in Portland high schools.

A follow-up study of the current work activities of Teacher Corps members who were formerly involved in delinquency programs.

A study of different perspectives on delinquency causation and treatment held by administrators and line personnel in delinquency agencies in Oregon.

Project reports and publications resulting from these activities are listed below:

Don C. Gibbons, "New Directions in Juvenile Justice," Project Report.

Don C. Gibbons, "Offender Typologies--Two Decades Later," British Journal of Criminology, April 1975.

David Griswold and Michael DeShane, "Criminal Justice Manpower Projections: Is There an Alternative?" Project Report.

Don C. Gibbons, Barry D. Lebowitz, and Gerald F. Blake, "Observations on Program Evaluation in Corrections," Crime and Delinquency, forthcoming.

Florence Yospe (ed.), Criminal Justice: A Multidisciplinary Bibliography, prepared jointly with Arizona State University.

Florence Yospe (ed.), "Diversion from the Juvenile Justice System: An Annotated Bibliography," Project Report.

Don C. Gibbons and Gerald F. Blake, "Concept Paper: LEAA Discretionary Funding Program for Juvenile Diversion."

David K. Roe, "Determination of Gun Discharge Residues by Trace Metal Analysis," Project Report.

Don C. Gibbons and Gerald F. Blake, "Building a Criminal Justice Ph.D."

Michael DeShane and David Griswold, "Educational Programs, Criminal Justice Manpower Needs, and New Directions in Education: Focus on Region X," Project Report.

Kathryn Farr and Cynthia Madaris, "An Institutional Experience for Juvenile Offenders," Project Report.

Kathryn Farr, "The Study of Female Crime: Approaches and Implications," Project Report.

Don C. Gibbons and R. Kelly Hancock, "The Future of Crime in American Society," paper presented at Pacific Sociological Association meetings, April 1975.

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.

Anthony J. Filipovitch, "The Structure of Neighborhood and Residential Security," Project Report.

Robert Broadhead, "Toward a Doctoral Education in Criminal Justice: Research Models and Curriculum Recommendations," Project Report.

Priscilla Kimboko (ed.), "The Impact of Divorce on Children and Their Parents: A Bibliography," Project Report.

Don C. Gibbons and Gerald F. Blake, "Perspectives in Criminology and Criminal Justice: The Implication for Higher Education Programs," paper prepared for the Conference on Key Issues in Criminal Justice Doctoral Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha (See Volume IV of these Reports).

Resa Lee Penn, "The Political Economy of Crime: An Annotated Bibliography."

Michael DeShane, Gerald F. Blake, and Don C. Gibbons, "Juvenile Diversion: Issues and Strategy" and "Appendix," prepared for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Operations Task Group, LEAA.

Michael Wiatrowski, "A Theoretical and Ethical Assessment of the Crime Control Problem in Portland," Project Report.

James Galvin, Gerald Blake, and Don C. Gibbons, "Model Program: Youth Diversion Project," prepared for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, LEAA.

Florence Yospe (ed.), "Program Evaluation in Corrections: An Annotated Bibliography," Project Report.

James Galvin, Gerald Blake, and Don C. Gibbons, "Evaluation Plan: LEAA Discretionary Funding Program for Youth Diversion," prepared for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, LEAA.

Don C. Gibbons and Gerald F. Blake, "Evaluating the Impact of Juvenile Diversion Programs," Project Report.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND SERVICES TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMUNITY (ADVISORY SERVICE TO LEAA AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES)

During 1975-76, the project is providing consultative services to the Multnomah County Sheriff's Department in the way of technical assistance in the establishment of management and informations system procedures.

In spring 1975, the project conducted a one-day seminar on criminal justice program evaluation for criminal justice practitioners in the State of Oregon. In fall 1975, a one-day seminar on the current status of treatment was conducted for local criminal justice practitioners, with Dr. Robert Marinson being employed as the principal speaker at that seminar.

During 1974-75, Gerald Blake and Don Gibbons have been involved in a number of consultative relationships with juvenile and criminal justice agencies in the community. Additionally, Gibbons served during 1975-76 as an Associate Member of the Governor's Task Force on Corrections.

As already indicated, a number of annotated bibliographies and other materials were prepared by the project personnel and disseminated to local and national criminal justice agencies.

The most ambitious activity carried on by the project is the diversion grant with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. During summer 1975, the project was awarded an LEAA grant of $109,000 for the purpose of providing a variety of kinds of consultation, assistance, and advice to OJJDP. Gibbons and Blake both were engaged for a fraction of their time on this project during 1975-76. A number of products have been turned out as part of this endeavor, including publications listed above.

HARD LINES DEVELOPED

The administration of Portland State University has assigned approximately $57,000 to the Urban Studies program for the continuation of the criminal justice program in 1976-77. This funding is designed to support the faculty members who will be directly involved in the criminal justice program, as well as to provide needed secretarial support, supplies, etc.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SELF-EVALUATION

The Consortium Agreement, signed on November 16, 1973, by the Presidents of seven Consortium universities, or their representatives, opens with the following statement:

> Seven universities have been funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, United States Department of Justice, for the express and explicit purpose of building or strengthening graduate programs in criminal justice or directly related studies at the doctoral level, not exclusively the Ph.D.

In terms of that objective, the impact of the Consortium grant on the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology at the University of Maryland has decidedly been a very positive and important one. After almost three years of supplementary funding by the grant, the Institute is emerging as an academic unit of much greater scope and depth of program than it was prior to the grant.

Within two months of the signing of the Consortium Agreement, the Criminology Program, which had been offering a Ph.D. degree in Sociology with specialization in criminology since 1946 was transferred to the Institute and broadened to include the entire field of criminal justice under the title Ph.D. in Criminal Justice and Criminology. The number of Ph.D. students in the Institute grew from 0 in the fall semester of 1973 to 24 in the fall of 1976. The measure of their progress is the fact that three of these students had completed their Ph.D. comprehensives by the end of the Consortium period with only the dissertations remaining to be done, while two more had taken two out of four comprehensives, and an additional group of five to six Ph.D. candidates were scheduled to take their comprehensives in the course of academic year 1976-77. During the period of the grant, the Institute awarded ten LEAA Research Fellowships, nine to Ph.D. candidates and one to facilitate completion of the M.A. degree. One Ph.D. degree (in Sociology with specialization in criminology) and one M.A. degree in Criminal Justice and Criminology were completed with the aid of these fellowship awards. Ten M.A. degrees were completed otherwise.

A further measure of the quality of the Institute's Ph.D. program is the fact that over the period of the last 18 months of the Consortium grant, six papers by Ph.D. candidates were accepted for presentation at national meetings: the American Society for Criminology, the National Institute of Crime and Delinquency, and the American Sociological Association. One of these papers was published in a national refereed journal. One of the Ph.D. students received an international fellowship for one month in Europe.

Over the same period the M.A. degree program, Criminology and Criminal Justice options, reached a total of 53 students as compared to 38 in the fall of 1973. The number of full-time undergraduate majors increased from 332 to some 650 (last computer printout for spring 1976) while registrations in Institute courses increased from 1495 to over 2900.

Parallel growth occurred in the number of faculty and graduate assistantships. Prior to the Consortium grant, the Institute's budget provided for 8 faculty lines and 7 graduate assistantships. Consortium funding added 5 visiting professorships and as many as 13 graduate assistants. With the termination of the Consortium, the University replaced the Consortium-funded faculty positions with 5 new state-funded faculty budget lines and added 5 assistantships. Consequently the Institute emerged in the post-Consortium period with 13 state-funded faculty positions and 12 graduate assistantships.

The growth in the depth and scope of the program is reflected also in the number of graduate courses offered by the Institute. By the fall of 1976, such courses numbered 24 as compared to 15 in the fall of 1973. The total number of courses and sections taught in one semester by the Institute increased from 23 to 36 in the same period.

Throughout its existence the Institute has recognized the importance of involving minority students and women in its graduate program. The University of Maryland grant proposal included a professorial position specifically for the recruitment of graduate minority students. As a result of these efforts, there are 3 Blacks in the Ph.D. program and 5 Blacks in the master's program, 13% in each program. There are 7 women in the Ph.D. program and 17 in the M.A. program, constituting 32% and 29%, respectively. There are 2 Spanish-surnamed students in the M.A. program as of the fall of 1976.

The general strengthening of the graduate program of the Institute and its faculty, during the grant period, is clearly indicated by the additional research and educational grants received by the Institute. Here should be mentioned the Minority Prison Community research project funded by the NIMH in the spring of 1974 for two years for a total of $180,000; the International Seminars and Training Programs in Criminal Justice project funded by LEAA in the fall of 1974 in the sum of

$350,000; Changes in Form and Dimensions of Criminality--National and Transnational, a conference funded ($25,000) by LEAA and organized jointly with the United Nations; a Criminal Justice Evaluation Unit funded by the State of Maryland Planning Agency, Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, for three years at about $12,000 a year.

In addition to the strengthening of the doctoral program, the Consortium Agreement specified as its purposes cooperation among the seven Consortium universities and the development of research, the latter, of course, being a component element of a Ph.D. program. The following are indicators of performance under this program.

As to the cooperative efforts of the Consortium universities, the University of Maryland took a very active part. Its Director and a number of the graduate faculty participated in all of the 20 meetings of the Board of Directors, which, in many ways, represented a unique series of seminars on graduate education in criminal justice, extended over a period of three years and with the participation of a number of outside experts. The Director served for a year as Chairman of the Consortium Board of Directors and for almost two years as Chairman of the Reports Committee. The Research Directors of the Maryland program took an active part in the meetings of the Research Directors. The University of Maryland developed a joint doctoral program in criminal justice and criminology with Eastern Kentucky University. As of the fall of 1976, two Ph.D. candidates from Eastern Kentucky University were completing their doctoral studies at the University of Maryland, and several additional students were in the early stages of the program at Eastern Kentucky University.

The Institute regularly extended invitations to its Consortium partners to the conferences it organized: the First National Private Security Conference, and the International Conference on Doctoral Level Education in Criminal Justice. One faculty member from a Consortium university was invited to participate in the International Seminar on the Sociocultural Factors in Nonmedical Drug Use. When the Director of the Maryland Institute was charged with the task of preparing the National Paper for the United States Delegation to the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, the Consortium universities were invited to consult in this undertaking, and all but one of the Directors attended a conference called for the purpose.

The intensification of research during the period of the Consortium grant was indicated above under the listing of other grants received. Several faculty members undertook individual research projects as the result of Consortium funding. With a number of graduate students participating, the Research Director carried out a student-victimization study on the College Park campus of the University of Maryland. Over a period of eight months, this project provided an excellent opportunity for experience in research methodology for the participants. A report on this project was presented at the 1976 American Congress of Correction.

The proceedings and reports on the conferences mentioned above have been published or are in the process of publication.

While the impact of the funds made available for the expansion of the doctoral program through the Consortium grant undoubtedly was a major factor in the growth described above, the very fact of the establishment of the Consortium as such for the purpose of strengthening doctoral programs was a crucial factor. The field of criminal justice education, as a new arrival on the academic scene, did not have the prestige that other disciplines commanded within the academic community. The LEEP program of LEAA began to change this situation, but this action by the federal government, signalling the national need for doctoral level education to produce planners, evaluators, researchers, and teachers for the field made a bid for and lent support to the status of criminal justice education on a par with other disciplines on the campuses. At the University of Maryland, this immediately became a major factor. While the criminal justice program was rapidly developing even before the grant, its status and respectability were noticeably enhanced. The growth of the program was unquestionably speeded up considerably. The other grants for educational research purposes mentioned above fitted into the pattern, as did the participation of the staff as individual scholars and professionals in the rich developments of the last several years in national and international activities in the field. Perhaps the most telling measure of the gains made at the University of Maryland by the criminal justice program is the above-reported readiness of the

University to take over into the state budget, at a time of very tight budget situation, a number of the positions first introduced on the basis of Consortium funding.

Viewed in an historical perspective, criminal justice education at the University of Maryland had four major events shape its development: the establishment of a specialization in criminology in the Department of Sociology in 1946, with the first Ph.D. in that specialization granted in 1947; the subsequent establishment of a Criminology Program as an autonomous unit in the Department of Sociology with its own director and special budget in the early sixties; the establishment of the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology in 1969; and, finally, the Consortium grant in 1973.

In summing up the impact of the Consortium grant on the graduate program in criminal justice at the University of Maryland, it is only fair to say that while any generalization about consortia in any field is hardly justifiable--because consortia are established for widely different purposes, differ organizationally, and their success depends on the circumstances at the given time and place--this particular Consortium and the accompanying grant proved to be singularly effective at the University of Maryland.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA SELF-EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION

The impact of the Educational Development Grant upon the University of Nebraska at Omaha must be analyzed from two different perspectives. First, most of the impact both in quantity and significance was the result of internal changes stimulated by the input of LEAA grant money into the University. The changes in this category should be considered as independent from any changes resulting from Consortium membership--changes which can be thought of as constituting a second category of educational development impact. This brief evaluation will describe, in summary form, both categories of impact. Finally, consideration will be given to possible interactions between the two categories of impact.

INDEPENDENT IMPACT

The LEAA Educational Development Grant made to the University of Nebraska at Omaha resulted in change throughout the University of Nebraska system which will endure far beyond the grant period. While it may be true that some of the changes that have occurred were inevitable, the grant speeded up the change process by years.

Before the grant, criminal justice education at the University of Nebraska at Omaha was typical of criminal justice education across the country. A faculty with weak educational credentials existed, a research/knowledge producing atmosphere was absent, and in general the quality of the overall curriculum was, at best, "low level."

The grant made possible a number of significant changes. First, the quality of the faculty was greatly improved. Starting with a faculty of whom only one possessed a doctorate, the grant made it possible to recruit a faculty with credentials appropriate to graduate education. Second, in a more subtle way, the grant was responsible for producing a research atmosphere that has been and will continue to be productive. Research is now legitimized and prized by the faculty, a dramatic change from an atmosphere where research was discouraged due to a view of research as being esoteric and impractical. Third, a new graduate program was initiated and, although extremely young and in need of revision, has produced a number of outstanding students--outstanding by virtue of their acceptance into prestigious doctoral programs. In addition, at least three proposals for post-master's programs were developed and will serve as future goals. Finally, the grant has been responsible for a vast increase in the quality of the total criminal justice curriculum. Movement from a "low-level" undergraduate program to an undergraduate program that is truly social-science oriented and academic in the strictest sense of the word has occurred in a matter of three years instead of the eight to ten years that would have been required without the grant.

The preceding changes or accomplishments that have been briefly mentioned represent only general observations.

Specific accomplishments too numerous to mention have occurred in research and publication and in pedagogical techniques.

CONSORTIUM IMPACT

Perhaps the greatest accomplishment of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium was the establishment of a network of academics who share a common interest--the improvement of criminal justice education. This was especially important for those Consortium schools with new and evolving undergraduate and graduate programs. For such schools, the Consortium represented a unique opportunity for the exchange of ideas on criminal justice education. In many instances, this exchange was the result of informal processes rather than the completion of the Consortium's formal agenda. As a result of over 20 meetings, intensive relationships that will endure have developed. For those of us desiring the advice and expert counsel of fellow criminal justice academicians, the Consortium has expanded our network of informational and intellectual exchange. The Consortium has served as a mechanism to lift the barriers of isolated perspective and geographic localism.

One can identify hard evidence of Consortium success. Manpower research, conferences and conference proceedings, and limited student and faculty exchange serve as examples. In spite of these examples, it is clear that the original goals of the Consortium were too broad and premature for the first life of the Consortium. Only near the end of the first life of the Consortium have the interrelationships between the schools evolved to the point that major consortium-qua-consortium research and development products can be developed.

Perhaps the major lesson the Consortium can contribute to higher education consists in two parts. First, the development of honest and genuine relationships among several universities, all of which are very different and in many respects unique, takes much longer than most would imagine or admit. Second, consortia can work; the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium is proof. By virtue of completing its planned life and by the desire of its membership to extend that life, the NCJEC has demonstrated that consortia are viable in American higher education.

INTERACTION: THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CONSORTIUM

Discerning the specific impact of the Consortium on the University of Nebraska at Omaha is difficult and may be premature. Like all of the universities, UNO probably contributed more to the Consortium in the form of time and energy than it derived from Consortium membership. Certainly UNO derived tangible benefits in the form of curricular ideas and developmental policy. Yet the most important benefits are less tangible than these and have stemmed from the informal processes that made up the real life of the Consortium. For example, UNO can now call on numerous representatives from six other universities for advice and service with extreme candor and ease. Additionally, genuine collegial relationships have been produced and exist between many UNO faculty and the faculty of other universities. While the exact importance of these things is hard to describe, they are extremely significant and are, in fact, the major benefit that UNO derived from Consortium membership.

CHAPTER 6. SUMMARY EVALUATION

The evaluation of the 406(e) grants has been an ongoing process throughout the grant period. Quarterly reports were filed with LEAA by each 406(e) grantee and the Coordinator's Office, and each institution was required to prepare a summary report for LEAA at the conclusion of its grant. As described in Chapter 5, two third-party evaluations were conducted by criminal justice educators from non-Consortium institutions. Also contained in that chapter are the self-evaluations written by the Project Directors concerning their individual 406(e) grants. In addition, Volume I of these Reports presents detailed narrative accounts of the particular experiences at each of the seven universities. Of necessity, the summary evaluation provided in this chapter is somewhat general in nature. Readers who desire more specific details should refer to the documents and publications cited above.

Three different perspectives should be considered in any analysis of the impact of the 406(e) monies upon criminal justice graduate education development: First, the major portion of the 406(e) monies was authorized as individual grants to seven universities to develop and strengthen graduate programs in criminal justice. Second, LEAA funded a secretariat or "Office of the Coordinator" to coordinate the various programs and activities agreed upon by the seven participating institutions. Third, the Consortium was developed after the individual universities had received their grants; its purpose was to provide a cooperative relationship among the institutions on the assumption that such collaborative efforts would contribute more to the criminal justice system; Consortium goals and objectives were developed and formalized in a Consortium Agreement. Thus, any evaluation must consider the goals and accomplishments of the individual institutions, the goals and objectives of the Office of the Coordinator, and finally the goals and objectives of the Consortium Agreement itself.

THE INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS

The 406(e) grants proposed for the development and strengthening of graduate programs over a three-year period. This frame of time might have appeared more than adequate from the viewpoint of the grantor. Most LEAA grants are for much shorter periods due to the intricacies of developing federal legislation and the frequent demand for immediate results. However, in developing new programs--especially at the doctoral level--such time constraints meet with considerable opposition at the university, where layers of committee activity and thoughtful, slow deliberation are considered necessary for quality curriculum development. Perhaps these constraints were not so apparent at those universities that were strengthening existing doctoral programs. But, of the five remaining institutions that were developing new programs, only one had a master's program in operation at the time of the initial grant award. If one assumes that the usual practice is first to develop a quality master's program before developing a doctoral program, then there remained a formidable task for those institutions seeking the development of both programs over the three-year period.

The lack of qualified graduate faculty at some universities also surfaced as a major obstacle in doctoral program development. Several universities without previous graduate programs in criminal justice were staffed mainly by faculty without terminal degrees who had been involved in undergraduate programs with heavy emphasis on preparing personnel for entry-level positions in criminal justice agencies. Limited emphasis had been placed on research and graduate curriculum development. Two of the universities had appointed individuals without terminal degrees as director of the administration of the grant. The overall absence of qualified graduate personnel did not create an atmosphere conducive to rapid doctoral program development.

At the time of grant expiration, new master's degree programs had been developed at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Northeastern University, and Portland State University. Arizona State University had inaugurated both bachelor's and master's degree programs in criminal justice. Eastern Kentucky

University had received approval for a joint doctoral program in cooperation with Michigan State University and the University of Maryland. Portland State University had developed a field-area specialization in criminal justice within the Urban Studies doctoral program, and Northeastern University had developed a doctor of philosophy program in forensic chemistry.

Both Michigan State University and the University of Maryland had established doctoral programs at the time the 406(e) grants were awarded. The grants for both universities allowed for considerable expansion of the number of students enrolled in their programs. In addition, at Michigan State University, the master of science degree program in the School of Criminal Justice was extensively revised, along with the undergraduate curriculum. The University of Maryland also had a considerable increase in the number of master's and undergraduate criminal justice majors at their institution during the grant period.

In the areas of research and technology transfer, substantial progress seems to have been made at each of the seven institutions. The universities' criminal justice programs were at varying degrees of sophistication at the time of grant inaugural, so it is difficult to assess the results at any one institution in relation to the others. However, numerous research projects were developed, and the research potential for faculty and students was broadly expanded. Numerous publications, reports, seminars, and conferences provided opportunities for technology transfer. Opportunities for exchange of ideas with

LEAA state and regional planning agencies, as well as with criminal justice agencies, were increased.

Finally, perhaps as a result of 406(e) monies, significant changes developed within the colleges, departments, or schools receiving the grant awards. New academic units were created or modified that had considerable impact upon entire university academic programs, and various cooperative academic endeavors were developed with other departments and colleges within the universities.

THE OFFICE OF THE COORDINATOR

The Office of the Coordinator was funded November 1, 1973, five months after the awarding of grants to the first individual institutions. The major purposes of the grant were to assure optimum utilization of the resources of the individual Consortium members and to assure that the results of their efforts received maximum distribution.

The Office of the Coordinator was housed at Arizona State University, but the Coordinator was accountable to the governing Board of Directors of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium. This Board was comprised of the Project Directors from the seven Consortium institutions. The following objectives were developed:

1. Collect research data from Consortium members and disseminate them to interested parties outside the Consortium and LEAA

2. Collect research data from agencies outside the Consortium and LEAA and disseminate them to Consortium members
3. Serve as a clearinghouse for research projects of Consortium members to reduce unnecessary duplication
4. Serve as chief liaison among the Consortium and state, local, and private agencies
5. Serve as a clearinghouse for technical assistance to and from the Consortium and Consortium members
6. Serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of faculty and students among Consortium members
7. Identify and implement the best way for the Consortium to publicize their activities to other educational institutions and functional criminal justice agencies: i.e., newsletters, journals, etc.
8. Provide technical, clerical, and other staff assistance to the Consortium and its members
9. Carry out other duties as requested by the governing Board of the Consortium.

In fulfilling these objectives, the Coordinator's Office carried out its basic role as a clearinghouse for Consortium activities as well as serving as a secretariat for Consortium meetings. In addition, the development, coordinating, editing, and production of the four volumes of these Reports required the utilization of the entire staff during the last year of the grant period.

THE CONSORTIUM AGREEMENT

To evaluate the Consortium Agreement, it is necessary to go into some detail regarding the organization and development of the Consortium in order to provide the background for future analysis. As mentioned previously, some of the individual institutions had been awarded grants five months prior to the Consortium Agreement. There had been no mention of Consortium activities per se in the proposals of the five institutions that had received their grants in June 1973. However, some general references to cooperative efforts had been made in the Special Conditions attached to each individual grant award. Special Condition 4 stated that "Representatives of the grantee institution will attend specified meetings for the purpose of providing advice and counsel to LEAA in concert and cooperation with other grantees. . . ." Special Condition 9 stated that "The grantee agrees that it will foster and encourage the exchange of faculty and other personnel between itself and other named grantees, or between itself and LEAA . . . for the purpose of an interlocking and cooperative joint effort by the named grantees and LEAA to build or strengthen quality graduate level criminal justice or related academic programs and to carry on needed research."

The vague language in the Special Conditions eventually led to the development of the Consortium Agreement, which was signed by the seven individual institutions, but not by LEAA. It would appear that the institutions, in their Agreement, acknowledged the need for group activities to further the development of criminal justice graduate education. However, the fact that LEAA did not participate in this Agreement caused some uncertainty within the individual institutions regarding their responsibilities in meeting the goals and objectives of their individual grant proposals.

Lack of communication between LEAA and its Regional Offices also had an effect on the development of the Consortium. From the outset, individual Consortium institutions were plagued with criticism from Regional Offices of LEAA and state planning agencies, other educational institutions offering criminal justice programs, and criminal justice agencies in general because of their lack of involvement in the decision-making process that had selected the Consortium members. The change in concept from the Centers of Excellence to the Consortium never had been clearly communicated by LEAA to interested agencies and institutions. Because of this lack of communication, there was considerable foot-dragging and lack of cooperation from regional and state planning agencies.

The grant award process also played a major role in the relationship of individual institutions to LEAA and the development of the Consortium Agreement. Each grant for the institutions was approved individually and on the basis of the application submitted; not all grant applications cited the development of doctoral degree programs as one of their program goals. For example, the application from the University of Nebraska at Omaha indicated that they would undertake "research [which] may lead to the development of a competent doctoral program." The Arizona State University application proposed to "develop undergraduate and graduate curricula relevant to the higher education needs for persons preparing for a career in the administration of justice. . . ." The Eastern Kentucky University proposal specified "the development of a cooperative doctoral program with one or more universities."

However, LEAA had attached almost identical Special Conditions to the grants awarded to each institution. One of these, Special Condition 7, stated: "The grantee agrees to build graduate degree programs, both at master's and doctoral levels, or to strengthen such programs where currently carried on by the grantee. This effort shall be tailored to the specific and particular thrust identified in the grantee's application for funds under Section 406(e) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (P. L. 90-351 as amended), or as it may be modified upon agreement with LEAA."

The vagueness and ambiguity of this Special Condition allowed for a wide variety of interpretations. Attempts to relate this Special Condition to the different narratives in the individual grant proposals led to considerable disagreement between the Consortium institutions and LEAA regarding the particular goals of individual institutions in curriculum development, as well as the goals of the entire Consortium in this area.

The chronology of the development of the Consortium was quite unusual. Grants were first awarded on an individual basis to develop and strengthen graduate programs; later the Consortium concept was applied to further those goals. Traditionally consortia have been established only after the participants have had a long period of time to get acquainted with each other and have carefully developed mutual relationships as a means of reaching a common goal. The geographical range of the Consortium institutions spanned the country; their personnel were generally unacquainted with each other; their criminal justice programs represented a wide variety of academic maturity. The expectation by LEAA that these institutions would progress immediately upon a course of action requiring great cooperation and understanding was unrealistic. Moreover, because of the three-year grant period, it was necessary for the universities to pursue program operation first with little or no time available for planning, staffing, and the development of mutual trust and cooperation.

The period of the Consortium grants from 1973-76 was also a period of time of considerable administrative reorganization and personnel changes for LEAA. As a result of administrative changes, responsibility for managing and monitoring of the 406(e) monies was moved in and out of various LEAA departments; over the three-year period at least six different LEAA administrators were responsible for program supervision. These changes in personnel led to various interpretations of the grant proposals and the role of the Consortium in relation to other LEAA programs. Such matters were not clearly agreed upon until the last year of the Consortium Agreement.

Although considerable resources had to be expended to alleviate the various problems that arose due to the complexities of developing the Consortium, it should not be assumed that the goals and objectives established in the Consortium Agreement were impossible to meet. To the contrary, numerous accomplishments were achieved, many goals were met, and there is hard evidence of Consortium success.

At the present time there exist, in strategically located geographic areas throughout the United States, seven universities that have cooperatively developed or strengthened programs in criminal justice graduate education and are thus better qualified to meet the academic and research needs of the complex criminal justice system. In addition, new relationships have been developed between LEAA and institutions of higher education that should provide numerous opportunities for higher education to take a more active role in the development of the pure and applied research so vital to the improvement of the criminal justice system.

The Consortium activities have provided for an exchange of ideas between LEAA and higher education personnel. Input into such areas as LEEP funding, internship program development, and graduate fellowship programs should allow for the development of new and continuing programs that best meet the needs of future criminal justice manpower development. Several of the major Consortium endeavors should have an important impact on criminal justice education for years in the future; for example, with the completed manpower study, LEAA should be able to ascertain more precisely the future manpower needs for criminal justice graduate education personnel.

As a result of the conference of criminal justice educators from the United States at the University of Nebraska at Omaha and the international conference held at the University of Maryland and the availability of the conference materials for doctoral program development, there is now a resource of materials available for future curriculum development. Moreover, the new programs developed by the institutions represent the most current thinking by criminal justice curriculum experts and should provide a model for continued curriculum development for other institutions of higher education in the future.

Although the original Consortium goals were perhaps too broad and ambitious for the early stages of the Consortium, an association of academics who shared in the interest of improving criminal justice graduate education was established. Intensive academic relationships have been developed providing for broad intellectual and informational exchange which should benefit the criminal justice system now and in the future.

Perhaps the overall Consortium endeavor can best be summarized by quoting the "Consortium Impact" assessment written by Project Director Vincent Webb for his evaluation of the effects of the 406(e) grant on the criminal justice education program at the University of Nebraska at Omaha:

> Perhaps the greatest accomplishment of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium was the establishment of a network of academics who share a common interest--the improvement of criminal justice education. This was especially important for those Consortium schools with new and evolving undergraduate and graduate programs. For such schools, the Consortium represented a unique opportunity for the exchange of ideas on criminal justice education. In many instances, this exchange was the result of informal processes rather than the completion of the Consortium's formal agenda. As a result of over 20 meetings, intensive relationships that will endure have developed. For those of us desiring the advice and expert counsel of fellow criminal justice academicians, the Consortium has expanded our network of informational and intellectual exchange. The Consortium has served as a mechanism to lift the barriers of isolated perspective and geographic localism.

The Consortium members' confidence in the future potential of cooperative endeavors is such that the Consortium has been extended by the seven universities for at least another year without additional funding from LEAA.

REFERENCES

Federal Electric Corporation. _A Programmed Introduction to PERT_. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963.

Patterson, Lewis D. "The Potential of Consortia." _Compact_, October 1971, pp. 19-22.

Patterson, Lewis D. _1973 Consortium Directory_. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1973.

U. S. Office of Education Report, 1965-1966. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIUM

A.S.U.

U.N.O.

M.S.U.

E.K.U.

U. of M.

N.U.

P.S.U.

END