NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM

VOLUME V

ANALYSIS OF CONSORTIUM ENDEAVOR

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEAA AND THE NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM: SOME RESULTS OF THE PARTNERSHIP

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 reflected in this report, which was prepared by the Board of Directors of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium, are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

January 1977

NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM

VOLUME V

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

The report presented in the pages of this volume centers on the endeavors of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium, an LEAA-funded effort of seven American universities working both separately and together in a consortium. The NCJEC involved Arizona State University, Portland State University, Michigan State University, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Eastern Kentucky University, Northeastern University, and the University of Maryland; and extended over a three-year period, from 1973 to September 1976. The National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium is discussed in some detail later in this report and has been analyzed at length in a series of volumes additional to the present one. This report focuses primarily upon the substantive products of the Consortium which may be of general utility to criminal justice educators and practitioners. However, before examining the work of the Consortium, some remarks are in order concerning the rise and proliferation of criminal justice educational programs across the nation.

Criminal justice programs in colleges and universities are of very recent origin. As Donald Newman has noted, these operations were virtually nonexistent before President Lyndon Johnson's declaration of war on crime in 1965.[1] Prior to 1965, there were only

---

[1]Donald J. Newman, Introduction to Criminal Justice (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1975), pp. vii-xiv.

a relatively few police science curricula or sociology-corrections programs scattered about the country.

A number of events came together in the early 1960's to lead to the proliferation of programs carrying such labels as Administration of Justice, Criminal Justice Administration, and the like. These included the growing fear of lawbreaking, particularly street crime, to which Richard Harris has given considerable attention.[2] According to Harris, the burgeoning of citizen concern for crime developed out of civil rights agitation in the 1960's, ghetto riots, radical student demonstrations, and protests against the war in Vietnam.

The federal government response to the national crime problem began in 1965 with the creation by President Johnson of the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The commission and its staff conducted the most searching study of crime in American society ever undertaken by the federal government. The summary report of the commission contained over 200 recommendations for the control and prevention of lawbreaking. That report eschewed facile proposals for the cure of crime and pointed to major renovations in American social structure rather than some minor tinkering with the criminal justice apparatus; the summary passages of the report called for a comprehensive attack on the "root causes" of crime.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice report ultimately led to the passage of the

---

[2]Richard Harris, The Fear of Crime (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968).

Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, providing for sizable federal expenditures on "crime fighting" throughout the United States. Not surprisingly, this increased federal role in the funding of crime control activities contributed both directly and indirectly to the growth of criminal justice educational programs. One of the major themes of the President's commission report and other commentaries on the crime problem was that trained manpower would be needed in vastly expanded numbers if the war on lawbreaking was to be waged successfully. Also, this line of argument held that these new, well-educated recruits to crime fighting would need to be equipped with a comprehensive understanding of the workings of the entire criminal justice machinery or system. This thesis was translated directly into federal support for educational programs in criminal justice, most notably through Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) loans. Some indication of the rapid pace with which criminal justice programs have sprung up in response to these forces is contained in Table 1 below:

Table 1

NUMBER OF DEGREE PROGRAMS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE[3]

Year	Number of Degree Programs				No. of Institutions Offering Degrees
	Associate	Baccalaureate	Master's	Ph.D.	
1966-67	152	39	14	4	184
1968-69	199	44	13	5	234
1970-71	257	55	21	7	292
1972-73	505	211	41	9	515
1975-76	729	376	121	19	664

[3]Richard W. Kobetz, Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Education Directory (Gaithersburg, Maryland: International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1975-1976. Reprinted by permission.

Most educational endeavors and degree programs in colleges and universities have grown up rather slowly, correlatively with the development of the basic disciplines underlying them. As a result, most degree programs in such fields as geology, sociology, mathematics, and the like have a relatively high degree of coherence and focus. In contrast, degree-granting units in criminal justice have been created almost overnight and have not developed in crescive fashion out of some relatively clear-cut scholarly discipline. The result is that, to a considerable degree, contemporary criminal justice is a field of study that is still in search of its basic identity.

Some evidence of the growing pains and lack of clear focus to criminal justice can be seen in a sampling of textbooks that have recently appeared in this area of study. For example, Prassel has written an introduction to criminal justice in which no explicit discussion of the nature of the field of study is offered.[4] Instead, one must divine the scope and character of criminal justice education from the overall contents of his book. Prassel tells us that criminal justice practitioners must have a relatively detailed understanding of (a) the total crime problem, (b) the workings of police agencies, (c) the courts, and (d) corrections. Although this conception is straightforward, it seems hardly the stuff out of which one might develop a scholarly conceptualization of a distinct field of study.

---

[4]Frank R. Prassel, Introduction to American Criminal Justice (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1975), pp. ix-xi.

Alan Kalmanoff's recent textbook also fails to offer an explicit definition or explication of the field of criminal justice study.[5] However, the context of his discussion does suggest that criminal justice employees must have some comprehension of the causes of crime and a detailed understanding of the workings of the system machinery and operations. Kalmanoff's text has little to say about the former and is heavily concentrated upon system operations. Accordingly, his text is quite different from conventional criminology books which concentrate much more heavily upon etiological issues and hypotheses and which relegate examination of the workings of the criminal justice system components to the latter half of the volume.

One of the more detailed and comprehensive discussions of the nature of criminal justice as a field of study is to be found in Newman's book (pp. vii-xiv). He begins by differentiating criminology from criminal justice studies, noting that the former is primarily concerned with etiological questions and also that it is a substantive concentration or area of emphasis within sociology. By contrast, he asserts that "criminal justice is mostly concerned with the decision process in the crime control agencies of police, prosecutor's offices, trial courts, and correctional facilities, and in programs like probation and parole" (p. x).

---

[5]Alan Kalmanoff, Criminal Justice (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976).

Newman also agrees with a number of other commentators concerning the outlines of criminal justice in holding that it is a "multidisciplinary" field which borrows its intellectual sustenance from a variety of the established disciplines, rather than being simply a form of applied criminology. Hence at one point he contends that:

> The distinction in research focus between the criminological emphasis on causal factors in contrast to research into the operational reality and effectiveness of criminal justice agencies has sometimes been viewed as merely a difference between "pure" and "applied" research, comparable to the relationship of chemistry and the practice of medicine. While there may well be some truth in this analogy, it is an oversimplified one. Criminal justice is not applied criminology; it may test certain theoretical propositions in criminology in terms of court or agency response to them, but it takes its basic building blocks from many sources, and is not limited to criminology or even to such operational specialties as police or correctional administration (p. x).

Don C. Gibbons and Gerald F. Blake have also endeavored to spell out some of the parameters of the emerging field of criminal justice.[6] Many of their views parallel those of Newman and a number of other persons who have commented on these matters. First, they argue that criminal justice is <u>not</u> a discipline; rather it is a synthetic and multidisciplinary field of study devoted to analysis and control of lawbreaking. Criminal justice does not represent a distinctive, unitary discipline comparable

---

[6]Don C. Gibbons and Gerald F. Blake, "Perspectives in Criminology and Criminal Justice: The Implications for Higher Education Programs," paper presented at the Conference on Key Issues in Criminal Justice Doctoral Education, Omaha, Nebraska, October 21-23, 1975, published in the <u>National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium Reports</u>, Volume IV, <u>Criminal Justice Doctoral Education: Issues and Perspectives</u>, pp. 80-127.

to sociology, economics, or political science. Instead, it draws upon the contributions of these and other basic disciplines in order to pose economic, sociological, legal, geographical, or other kinds of questions about crime and responses to it.

Gibbons and Blake also contend that a distinctive feature of criminal justice is that it is an applied field of study which endeavors to equip its graduates to do things, to perform important tasks in the real world of public policy. Accordingly, criminal justice education stresses program evaluation skills, program budgeting, program planning, criminal justice research, and kindred topics that are not usually given much emphasis in traditional criminology programs.

A third point made by Gibbons and Blake is that the sophisticated criminal justice practitioner needs to acquire a good deal of theoretical wisdom from his educational experience. They reject the pejorative labeling of some programs in criminal justice as overly "theoretical," for they eschew the argument that criminal justice education ought to be centered about inculcation of pedestrian kinds of "how-to-do-it" skills. The war on crime calls for persons who can think creatively about new responses to the problem of lawbreaking and requires more than some minor tinkering with the existing system.

In summary, Gibbons and Blake argue that the well-trained criminal justice graduate, particularly one produced by a doctoral program, should be a theorist, scholar, and technician who can utilize all of these attributes in the world of criminal justice practice.

Although the remarks of Newman and Gibbons and Blake run parallel, it should not be supposed that these persons and others who have examined the parameters of criminal justice education have identified the full range of issues or questions that need to be addressed. Also, one would be off the mark in assuming that there is a pronounced degree of consensus among criminal justice educators on specific issues of criminal justice education. Instead, most of the key questions in this field of study are moot and are matters on which much debate currently rages. A number of these quarrels and controversies on criminal justice education are discussed in detail in one of the volumes produced by the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium. A summary of that volume is presented in Section IV of this report.

One of the open questions revolves around opinions as to the disciplinary status of criminal justice. Newman, Gibbons and Blake, and some others maintain that there is no clearly identifiable discipline of criminal justice, but there are other views on this matter. It is possible to identify a number of scholars who argue that criminal justice is an emerging, distinctive academic discipline.

A second substantive quarrel concerning criminal justice centers about the relationships of this field or discipline to other areas of study such as criminology. There are some persons who contend that criminal justice is little more than applied criminology, while there are others who emphasize the multidisciplinary and eclectic character of the field. A related controversy has to do with the extent to which criminal justice education ought to

concentrate upon relatively narrow topics such as evaluation methodology, police administration, forensic chemistry, or court administration, as opposed to stressing broader and more theoretical concerns. Exponents of the latter position would urge the development of criminal justice programs which have a heavy concentration of interest upon etiological issues, the analysis of deviance, and examination of the backdrop of broad societal patterns and trends within which lawbreaking occurs.

Still another argument among criminal justice educators which often lies just barely below the surface concerns the issue of whether educational programs ought to concentrate upon skills and information related to upgrading of the existing criminal justice system or whether criminal justice education ought to adopt a more critical and forward-looking posture. A wide range of positions on this question can be identified, with some educators contending that efforts ought to be directed principally at upgrading the delivery of services through the existing criminal justice machinery, while other persons argue equally vigorously for criminal justice education that places heavy emphasis upon diversion programs, decriminalization, and the like, as well as upon a variety of efforts to restructure major social institutions in order to bring about reductions in crime and delinquency. Advocates of the first approach to criminal justice education exhibit much more sympathy for courses in forensic science, court administration, and kindred topics than do exponents of a more critical version of criminal justice education.

These disagreements about the nature and scope of criminal justice as a field of study have analogues in debates about the institutional form which these programs ought to take. A number of these differing viewpoints on the most appropriate organizational structure for criminal justice educational programs are enumerated in the volume produced by the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium to be discussed in Section IV of this report. But, let us note in passing that a variety of institutional arrangements have grown up, so that some programs--such as the criminal justice area of specialization at Portland State University--exist as part of another educational enterprise--in that case, the School of Urban Affairs. Doctoral candidates in that program are involved in an Urban Studies degree program with specialization in criminal justice. On the other hand, there are a number of graduate programs in criminal justice which are lodged in schools, centers, or institutes of criminal justice, including the programs at the State University of New York at Albany, Michigan State University, the University of Maryland, and Arizona State University.

A good deal of variability can also be seen in the specific curricula in criminal justice that have developed in these various institutions in which graduate education in criminal justice is being offered, even though most of these programs tend to include roughly similar courses in crime causation, research methods, planning and evaluation, and administrative matters. What all of this confusion on questions of the nature of criminal justice inquiry, criminal justice educational organization, and

criminal justice curricula adds up to is the distinct impression that this educational area has not yet congealed into a relatively distinct and uniform program of study existing nationwide. Clearly, one cannot show many parallels between existing programs in criminal justice and professional training programs in such fields as medicine, law, and the like, where relative consensus exists on questions of educational content and structure.

One or two other broad comments about the status of criminal justice education are in order. For one, those who speak about a criminal justice system are often engaged in a misleading metaphor, in that what currently passes for a justice apparatus often bears greater similarity to a malfunctioning machine than to a coherent, integrated system. Close examination of the workings of the criminal justice process quickly turns up evidence indicating that it often operates more as a nonsystem than as a well-oiled piece of people-processing social machinery.[7]

Another observation, having to do with the underdeveloped state of criminal justice education, centers about the paucity of a supporting literature as the intellectual foundation of the emerging field of study. One of the key indicators of the immaturity of criminal justice studies is that while there is a relatively vast criminological literature dealing with etiological

---

[7]The nonsystem character of the criminal justice apparatus and the value conflicts among groups of functionaries within that structure are discussed in considerable detail in Don C. Gibbons, Joseph L. Thimm, Florence Yospe, and Gerald F. Blake, Jr., Criminal Justice Planning: An Introduction (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977).

questions and kindred topics, relatively little written material has yet been produced on the applied side of criminal justice practice. For example, although criminal justice practitioners are frequently called upon to engage in justice planning activities, they have until recently been unable to draw upon a body of written material on that topic. It has only been in the last few years that a few relatively comprehensive essays on justice planning have become available.[8] Then too, some of these monographs that have appeared to date are not entirely satisfactory, in that they are lacking in scope or depth.

The remarks to this point have sketched out some of the background details against which the LEAA-funded National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium occurred. These comments indicated that this specific venture took place during a time of considerable confusion and turmoil concerning criminal justice education, mirroring the growing pains accompanying the birth of a new field of study. As the reader will see in the pages to follow, the experiences of the Consortium and its members were affected in many ways by the larger set of events.

---

[8]Gibbons, Thimm, Yospe, and Blake, op. cit.; Daniel Glaser, Strategic Criminal Justice Planning (Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1975); Michael O'Neill, Ronald F. Bykowski, and Robert S. Blair, Criminal Justice Planning: A Practical Approach (San Jose: Justice Systems Development, Inc., 1976).

II. THE NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM EXPERIENCE

Although the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has played a direct or indirect part in a number of criminal justice education endeavors during the past half dozen years, one of the most ambitious of these ventures was the funding of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium. The NCJEC was a three-year endeavor, inaugurated in the fall of 1973, and designed to lead to the development or strengthening of graduate education, including Ph.D. programs, at the seven member institutions: Arizona State University, Portland State University, Michigan State University, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Eastern Kentucky University, Northeastern University, and the University of Maryland. Michigan State University and the University of Maryland had doctoral programs in existence at the time of the creation of the Consortium, while the other five were charged with developing new doctoral programs. These seven universities formed the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium, working toward a number of collaborative goals such as faculty and student exchange, joint research projects, and the like, as well as developing graduate education at their individual campuses. In addition, a separately funded Coordinator's Office for the Consortium was established at Arizona State University.

The three-year experience of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium has been discussed in considerable detail in a set of four volumes which grew out of that endeavor. A limited number of these volumes have been printed and are available to interested readers until the supply is exhausted. The present summary report of Consortium accomplishments is not designed to duplicate these detailed volumes alluded to above. However, a brief description of the contents of the four volumes is in order.

As in all human events, individual historical episodes are to some degree unique. In the case of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium, 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. The five institutions which were without Ph.D. programs at the beginning of this developmental venture made varying degrees of progress toward that goal, so that Portland State University created and implemented an Urban Studies-criminal justice Ph.D. during the project period, while some of the other universities were somewhat impeded in their efforts. Even so, considerable progress overall was achieved. Then too, Michigan State University and the University of Maryland did strengthen their existing doctoral programs in important ways. Volume I 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 histories in Volume I.

But, the historian's task is also one of extracting commonalities of experience out of somewhat parallel historical events. Although no two economic developments, revolutions, wars, or educational events are entirely similar, some common threads can be discerned among them. Volume II 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 need. 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 presents the results of a comprehensive attempt on the part of the Consortium institutions to provide some tentative answers to these queries. The methods and conclusions of that study are outlined in Section III of the present report.

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 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. A brief description of that conference, a listing of papers presented, and a summary statement from the conference can be found in Section IV of this report.

Much of the work of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium is described in the four volumes outlined above. However, there were some other products of this endeavor that ought to be singled out for attention. For one, the University of Maryland conducted an international conference on criminal justice education during July 1976 which was a joint effort of that university and the other Consortium institutions. A number of criminologists from foreign countries attended that conference, along with a number of representatives of American criminal justice. Although numerous topics and issues were debated there, two major conclusions from that conference are salient to this

report. First, the conference confirmed the impression that "criminal justice" studies represent an American invention, for relatively few parallel efforts are to be found in other nations. Instead, foreign scholars show more similarity to traditional academic criminologists than they do to American criminal justice educators. Second, foreign criminological work differs rather markedly from American criminal justice activities, in that the former tends to be almost exclusively university-based, with non-American criminologists showing tenuous linkages, at best, to correctional practice and to research questions emanating from the field of criminal justice operations.

The individual universities which formed this Consortium engaged in a wide variety of activities centering upon curriculum development, faculty enrichment, and strengthening of ties between the university and local criminal justice communities, as well as the production of a number of research reports and other criminal justice knowledge. Limitations of space preclude a detailed listing of all the specific products turned out by the member institutions. However, Section V of this report does enumerate some of the major outputs which may be of greatest interest and usefulness to criminal justice educators and practitioners. Most of these products are available upon request from the specific institutions that authored these projects.

III. THE NATIONAL MANPOWER STUDY*

THE STUDY METHODOLOGY

The Manpower Research Project was designed to determine the degree to which graduate level criminal justice personnel are needed in institutions of higher learning, research corporations conducting criminal justice research, and in LEAA and related agencies. The project was undertaken by a task force of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium in December 1974, with Robert W. Ullman of Eastern Kentucky University as chairman. Since the National Planning Association had been awarded a grant to conduct a national manpower study of operational agencies, it was decided not to include these agencies in the Consortium study.

An educational manpower questionnaire was sent to all institutions of higher education listed in the Community and Junior College Directory and the Education Directory. The data were collected by institutions in the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium, with Eastern Kentucky University surveying LEAA Regions 2, 4, 6, 10; Northeastern University surveying LEAA

---

*Material in this section was extracted and adapted from the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium Reports, Volume III, Criminal Justice Education Manpower Survey, by James W. Fox and Robert W. Ullman.

Region 1; the University of Maryland surveying LEAA Region 3; Michigan State University surveying LEAA Region 5; the University of Nebraska at Omaha surveying LEAA Regions 7 and 8; and Arizona State University surveying Region 9. The completed questionnaires were then forwarded to Eastern Kentucky University for processing, collating, coding, and analysis.

The first part of the survey consisted of two phases. The questionnaire was initially sent to institutions in Region 4. Revisions were made in the questionnaire as a result of responses from this region. In the second phase, Regions 1-3 and 5-10 were surveyed. This involved three mailings and a telephone follow-up only to those schools identified from prior studies as having criminal justice programs. A telephone follow-up coupled with another mailing was made to schools in Region 4 previously identified as having programs in criminal justice but who had not responded to the first set of mailings. Of the 2881 institutions contacted, 2143 or 74 percent completed the questionnaire.

Research organizations engaged in criminal justice research were surveyed to determine their needs for criminal justice advanced degree personnel. Questionnaires were mailed to 184 private research organizations included on the LEAA bidders list from 1972 to 1975. Two follow-up questionnaires and a telephone call were attempted to all who had not responded. Of a total of 184 organizations, 65 percent had moved and left no forwarding address, were no longer in business, were not presently engaged

in criminal justice research, or could not be located. There were only 32 returned and usable questionnaires.

To explore the need for criminal justice personnel with criminal justice master's or doctoral degrees, the task force members conducted a feasibility study of selected state planning agencies located close to their employment bases. The SPA's studied were located in Arizona, Hawaii, Nevada, Kentucky, Maryland, and Nebraska. Survey efforts were achieved through site visitation and/or phone interviews. Data on current personnel qualifications were obtained through the aid of personnel directors and from published material prepared by the SPA's for their LEAA grants' application and for their comprehensive state plans. The personnel department of LEAA provided the task force with a computer print-out of relevant personnel data on all "full-time permanent" and "full-time temporary" professional staff employed by LEAA and its regional offices as of June 1975.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Criminal justice degree programs were reported by 867 of the 2143 institutions of higher education which returned questionnaires, indicating at least 867 potential employers for master's or doctoral level criminal justice graduates, by far the most promising source of employment found in this study. Further, those figures probably underestimate the number of educational openings, in that 26 percent of the institutions of higher education did not respond. While most of these probably failed to

return questionnaires because they had no program, surely some of them have criminal justice programs.

The most striking finding in the survey of research agencies listed by LEAA as potential contractors was that 77 (42 percent) were no longer at the address indicated, had left no forwarding address, and could not be reached by telephone. An observation by one respondent was echoed by several others: "This doesn't apply to me. I once asked LEAA for an RFP copy and they put me on their mailing list--an act which the tides of bureaucracy have apparently rendered irreversible." The research agencies that did respond did not indicate that research work would be a promising employment possibility for criminal justice master's or doctoral program graduates.

The limited survey of state planning agencies and the LEAA offices in Washington, D. C., and in the ten regions indicated that LEAA and its related agencies do not employ graduates of criminal justice master's or doctoral programs in any significant number. These agencies are staffed by lawyers, with other disciplines, particularly the social sciences, also represented. However, it should be noted that these observations are made on the basis of limited data, and, although they are not now employing criminal justice graduates, some directors of these agencies expressed a desire to do so in the future. Of course, these expressions of intent may or may not get transferred into action through actual hiring of criminal justice graduate degree holders.

The findings of the survey indicate that educational institutions may be an important potential employer of today's master's level graduates. Of the three types of institutions, two-year colleges appeared to have the greatest need for these graduates. Approximately 60 percent of all projected needs for master's degree teaching personnel were found in the two-year institutions. The remaining 40 percent were almost evenly distributed between four-year colleges and universities.

With budget constraints assumed to be in effect, the responding academic administrators reported a projected total need for the 1975-80 period of 1095 master's degree personnel: 186 specialists in corrections; 311 in criminal justice; 468 in law enforcement, police science/administration, and security combined; and 130 (12 percent) in law, criminalistics, criminology, court administration, and other fields. Again, these must be viewed only as tentative projections in that 26 percent of the sampled institutions did not respond. Personnel needs could be significantly higher if a larger proportion of programs exists among nonrespondents than was found for those responding institutions of higher education. It is possible that the actual total of needed master's degree personnel could approach 1200, with over 200 in corrections, over 350 in criminal justice, and over 500 in law enforcement.

A second observation is also in order. The overall response rate of 74 percent masks a good deal of variation across regions; that is, response rates varied from 49 percent to 89 percent in

the ten LEAA regions. These variations in response rates certainly affect the validity of the data for a specific region. Thus, all estimates require the caveat that they are conditioned by sample representativeness and adequacy, a familiar observation, but one which has particular import for these data.

When educational administrators were asked to identify personnel needs under a situation of minimal budgetary constraints, personnel estimates increased by approximately 100 percent to a total of 1947 additional full-time master's degree graduates who would be employed during the next five-year period. Of these, 550 would be needed by 1976, another 674 by 1978, and an additional 723 by 1980.

Administrators of four-year colleges estimated a decreasing need for full-time master's degree faculty during this period. However, they suggested a continued demand for part-time master's degree faculty, with the total annual needs remaining relatively constant after 1976. The ratio of part-time to full-time master's degree faculty, with budget constraints considered, was 2.4 to 1, while the same ratio was 1.5 to 1 without budget restraints.

These forecasts of personnel needs refer to additional, or new, positions estimated by the program administrators. However, employment opportunities also develop from faculty attrition. To estimate the impact of attrition, the Bureau of Labor Statistics attrition rate of .0268 was used, with the result that an anticipated total of 25 master's degree faculty would be lost by attrition in 1975-76. For the entire 1975-80 period, 210 master's

degree faculty openings could be expected to develop through attrition. Thus, 1305 (i.e., 1095 plus 210) master's degree faculty can be expected to be required over the five-year period.

Turning to the relationship between the anticipated needs for master's degree faculty in criminal justice higher education and the anticipated number of graduates, it is clear that college education comprises a significant portion of the potential employment market, but is not by any means sufficient to absorb all graduates. There are presently 2570 full-time and 4060 part-time master's degree candidates enrolled in colleges and universities. Higher educational institutions may be able to employ less than one-fourth of the graduates anticipated for 1976. With the low rate of employment of criminal justice master's degree graduates by the other agencies studied here, it appears that many of these graduates will need to look to operating agencies as the best alternative employment possibility. Indeed, many will need to search for jobs entirely outside of the criminal justice field.

Doctoral level faculty members (Ph.D., D. Crim., or Ed.D.) in 1974-75 made up approximately 34 percent of the full-time criminal justice faculty in institutions of higher education. Of these, 68 percent were at universities, 25 percent were at four-year colleges, and 7 percent were at two-year colleges.

Anticipated needs for additional full-time criminal justice doctoral faculty for 1975-76 reflected a very similar distribution: 64 percent in universities, 25 percent in four-year colleges, and 11 percent in two-year colleges. These projections

were made under the assumption of budget restraints. Without budget restraints, the estimates were nearly double. For the entire 1975-80 period, the program administrators, assuming budget constraints, estimated that they will need 434 doctoral level faculty in universities, 171 in four-year colleges, and 87 in two-year colleges. It is interesting to note that the percentages tend to hold constant in terms of the distribution of estimated doctorate needs among the three types of institutions.

Areas of specialization for these needed criminal justice doctoral level faculty are also of considerable interest. Of the total needed for the 1975-80 period, 32 percent (222) were categorized under the specialty of criminal justice. Law enforcement and corrections were the next most frequently mentioned specialties, with 23 percent (159) and 21 percent (147), respectively, while other specialty areas accounted for the remaining 24 percent (164). These estimates were also based on the assumption of budgetary limitations on hiring. Again, the removal of budget restraints as a consideration increases the estimates by a little more than 100 percent.

It was estimated that there would be an attrition of 15 doctoral faculty from 1974-75, based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics attrition rate (.01925) for doctoral level personnel (753 doctoral faculty x .01925 = 14+). Following the same procedure as was used in the estimates of attrition for master's degree faculty (though with the rate of .0268), it was estimated that 106 full-time doctoral level faculty will be lost through

attrition over this 1975-80 period. Thus, combining the projected new positions (692) and the replacements needed to maintain present positions (106), 798 full-time doctoral level criminal justice faculty will be required in the 1975-80 period in institutions of higher education.

These predictions are probably on the conservative side, in that new positions required in nonresponding institutions are not included here. Accordingly, the actual need for Ph.D. graduates to fill new positions could exceed 800, and needed replacements could number as many as 150, totalling 950 doctoral degree recipients in the five-year period.

There were 400 doctoral candidates in criminal justice educational programs in 1975, 317 of whom were full-time students. Obviously, not all 400 candidates will complete their degree programs, but an estimate of 300 doctoral level graduates during the five-year period would not be extreme. If the projected personnel needs of the program administrators materialize, 498 of the 798 positions for doctoral level faculty may have to be filled, as many are today, with graduates from other disciplines or with master's degree holders. In summary, it appears likely that the needs for criminal justice Ph.D.'s will outstrip production of such persons.

This discussion of doctoral level criminal justice faculty has been restricted to full-time faculty. If the estimated 531 part-time criminal justice faculty at the doctoral level identified by administrators were included, the total manpower needs at the doctoral level in criminal justice education are quite impressive.

The employment potential for doctoral level criminal justice personnel in such agencies as the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, state planning agencies, and research agencies is not yet clear. Even so, these operating agencies could exacerbate the shortage of doctoral level criminal justice personnel. Furthermore, many agency directors have indicated that they would like to employ criminal justice doctoral degree recipients but that they have been unable to do so. In fact, directors of doctoral programs have found that almost half of their doctoral level graduates have gone to some type of operational or planning agency.

CONCLUSIONS

What do the findings reported here say to the student, to the educator, to the criminal justice planner, and to the LEAA administrator? Are we witnessing a major shift toward an increasingly higher level of education throughout the criminal justice system? Or, will the invasion of the justice system by college-trained persons merely level off and continue in its present form? Perhaps we are observing a transitory surge which will be followed by the drying up of employment opportunities because these were created by shaky resources such as LEAA funds and other "soft money."

The fate of advanced degree holders may well depend upon the level of performance of these graduates. If the few who have found employment in the agencies discussed in this volume are able to demonstrate that their educational experiences are germane to

the real world, opportunities will probably open up in research agencies, state planning agencies, LEAA, or elsewhere in the Department of Justice. On the other hand, if these graduates fail to demonstrate their worth, the present picture of infrequent agency employment of master's or doctoral level graduates will continue.

The increased employment of college-educated criminal justice personnel by operating agencies can be expected to continue if for no other reason than that it is part of a broader trend toward requiring college degrees of workers in a variety of settings. The impact of this trend upon graduate level criminal justice education will be indirect but substantial. The operating agencies need and desire college-educated personnel, the colleges preparing these personnel therefore require criminal justice educators, and the universities consequently have a growing need for doctoral level criminal justice educators to prepare those who will staff the undergraduate programs. This set of interactions is of considerable importance at the present time, and many of those involved in criminal justice higher education believe that it will continue and probably expand.

The thrust of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences and other organizations toward setting accreditation requirements for institutions of higher education is also relevant to this discussion. There is much concern now being voiced by educators and agency administrators alike regarding deficient faculty qualifications on the part of many teachers in many institutions

preparing college-educated criminal justice workers. Those low-level programs could keep the overall quality of criminal justice higher education at such a low level that operating agencies may find no advantage to employing graduates, with repercussions through both American criminal justice higher education and the criminal justice system. The adequacy of the responses of the American criminal justice system to pressures in the future will be directly related to the quality of the personnel in the system.

Clearly, if the responses to the manpower survey have validity, higher education faces a large and demanding challenge in the mandate to prepare doctoral graduates for the criminal justice job market over the next five years and beyond. Moreover, the impact of this difficult task has arisen at the same time that many institutions are being forced to cut back on expenditures and programs and to limit enrollments in new areas such as criminal justice doctoral programs.

The task of meeting current needs for criminal justice doctorates presents several difficulties to academic administrations. Financial exigencies are, of course, crucial impediments. However, an additional problem is that the criminal justice doctorate crunch may exist only for the next five years or so, not beyond. The production of doctorates will require gearing up large and expensive programs which may have to be drastically curtailed once these needs have been met. It cannot be assumed that the demand for criminal justice doctorates will continue at the same level indefinitely.

Finally, there is the problem of gaining acceptance for criminal justice doctoral level education programs on university campuses. At many institutions these programs are regarded with suspicion or disdain by many faculty persons, without whose support no doctoral program can function. This faculty hostility is nourished by the economic difficulties of the institutions as well as doubts about the long-term need for criminal justice graduate programs.

The message for the master's level student is: prepare yourself in depth and in breadth; be ready possibly to teach, possibly to do research, but most likely, to work in a criminal justice operating agency. The advice for the doctoral level student is that the next five years appear to offer considerable opportunity for employment in college teaching.

LEAA planners and administrators can take considerable pride in the accomplishments that have been made in the area of criminal justice higher education. Within a very short period of time, a very complex, usually implacable, and always cumbersome nonsystem of higher education has been nudged, cajoled, and enticed into responding to the needs of criminal justice. This has happened in spite of a certain lack of familiarity on the part of LEAA administrators with problems and processes in the administration of higher education.

The support of criminal justice higher education by the federal government through LEAA has been fairly impressive, but that argument should not be pushed too far. Federal support has not

yet matched the level provided for agriculture, medicine, or education. Provision of domestic tranquility, specifically mentioned by the founding fathers as a purpose of this national government, will continue to need the kind of federal support seen in recent years--support which promises such domestic tranquility through a responsive and sensitive law enforcement, a responsible and efficient judicial system, and a nonrepressive, fair, and rehabilitative correctional system. Moreover, domestic tranquility requires an integration of this enlightened criminal justice apparatus into the total social fabric--including the educational arena, the economy, and the political system.

IV. KEY ISSUES IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION

THE CONFERENCE

The Conference on Key Issues in Criminal Justice Doctoral Education was sponsored and conducted by the Department of Criminal Justice, University of Nebraska at Omaha. It was held on October 21-23, 1975, at the Omaha Hilton Hotel and was attended by a large number of criminal justice educators, including many faculty members from the other six Consortium institutions. The following formal papers were presented at the Conference:

"The Nature of the Criminal Justice Doctorate"

Dr. Richard A. Myren, Dean
School of Criminal Justice
State University of New York at Albany

"A Philosophy of Criminal Justice Education"

Dr. Bruce T. Olson
Regional Criminal Justice Training Center
Modesto, California

"Faculty Development in Criminal Justice Education"

Dr. Donald H. Riddle, President
John Jay College of Criminal Justice

"Interdisciplinary Education in a Macro-Systems Perspective"

Dr. Harvey Treger
Jane Addams School of Social Work
University of Illinois, Chicago Circle

Dr. Narayan Viswanathan
Adelphi University

"Graduate Research and Education in Forensic Science"

James M. Parker
Institute of Chemical Analysis, Applications and Forensic Science
Northeastern University

"Police and Universities: Problems of Collaboration"

Mary Ann Pate
Dallas Evaluation Office
The Police Foundation

"The Police and the Doctorate"

Dr. Lawrence Sherman
Yale University

"Perspectives in Criminology and Criminal Justice: The Implications for Higher Education Programs"

Dr. Don C. Gibbons
Dr. Gerald F. Blake, Jr.
Portland State University

"Integrating Curriculum Design with Market Forces"

Dr. John K. Hudzik
Michigan State University

"Criminal Justice Education--The Latent Consequences of Overfunding"

Dr. Robert G. Culbertson
Grand Valley State Colleges

It should be clear from this listing of titles that these papers ranged over a broad terrain of interests and controversies in criminal justice education. All of the issues touched upon in the opening portion of this report were dealt with in considerable detail, but additionally, a number of other queries were also broached. It would be an almost impossible task to summarize in brief fashion all of the disparate lines of commentary that were pursued in that Conference, so that the interested reader

will need to obtain a copy of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium Reports, Volume IV, Criminal Justice Doctoral Education: Issues and Perspectives, in which all of these papers are either reproduced or abstracted, along with some additional observations from that Conference. However, the Conclusions from that volume are reproduced in the following section.

CONCLUSIONS

The rise of undergraduate programs in Administration of Justice, Criminal Justice, or allied rubrics, along with the burgeoning of graduate programs in Criminal Justice, is one of the most recent and prominent developments in American higher education. A whole new field of study, involving sizable numbers of faculty members and a large body of students, has sprung up almost overnight. The rise of these programs is a reflection of heightened concern about crime in contemporary America. More directly, these ventures in higher education have been stimulated by a number of responses to the crime problem at the federal government level, including the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, the passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and the creation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. A major theme running through all of these responses has been that increased and sharpened intellectual weaponry, in the form of trained manpower supplied by American colleges and universities, must be developed for the war on crime.

The birth of this new field of study, criminal justice, has not been without individually felt pains and a good deal of institutional discomfort. At the time of the establishment of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium and even today, three years later, a number of basic issues and questions concerning criminal justice education are still mooted. This volume [Volume IV of the NCJEC Reports] was intended to identify some of the major issues and to stimulate dialogue upon them, but was not designed to provide final answers to these key issues. Indeed, one thrust of many of the papers in this volume [IV] is that it would be premature to seek closure on many of these issues. The educational development experience has not yet run its course, criminal justice studies are still at a developing, adolescent stage, and there is still much to be learned before the final outlines of a mature field of criminal justice inquiry will be clear to all concerned.

But, while many of the key issues in criminal justice education will continue to be matters of lively debate for some time to come, it is possible to offer some broad and tentative observations, drawn from the experiences of the seven Consortium institutions in criminal justice educational development activities, discussions with other educators outside the Consortium, and from the contributed essays in this volume [IV].

First, nearly all would agree that there is a body of knowledge pertaining to crime, its causes and control, that can be brought together to provide the intellectual focus for crime-

fighting activities. Then too, many of the papers in this volume [IV] have indicated that there are a number of practical or organizational arguments in favor of locating educational programs which deal with this knowledge in relatively autonomous academic units.

At the same time, a number of commentators on criminal justice education, including some of the contributors to this volume [IV], have hastened to argue that criminal justice is a synthetic and multidisciplinary field of study, rather than a new, coherent, single discipline. Criminal justice education at both the undergraduate and graduate levels draws much of its intellectual sustenance from a variety of long-established disciplines and areas of inquiry, such as sociology, criminology, anthropology, economics, political science, and kindred fields. The preceding pages of this volume [IV] reveal a good deal of disagreement among criminal justice educators regarding the long-term prospects for a wholly separate and viable discipline of criminal justice.

Whatever the ultimate outcome of the movement toward criminal justice educational programs, it seems likely that criminal justice education will need to nurture and sustain continued intellectual interchange with the ancillary fields of inquiry such as criminology, political science, economics, and sociology. In these times of challenge, rapid social change, social and economic dislocation, and social turmoil, criminal justice education can ill afford to become isolated from other fields of inquiry in

which analyses of crime and responses to it are being carried forth.

Another point on which most observers are in general agreement is that the crime control apparatus in America today does not yet operate as an entirely well-coordinated system. In considerable part, it is a misnomer to speak of the criminal justice system, for what is often more apparent is a halting, uncoordinated justice machinery. At the same time, there is a growing chorus of commentary in which criminal justice administrators, governmental officials, and criminal justice educators are all calling for increased attention to the development of a more coordinated system of law enforcement, judicial processing, correctional activities, and preventive endeavors. The warning has been sounded that unless greater system coordination is achieved within coming years, the entire criminal justice processing apparatus will collapse.

However, once we move beyond these broad recommendations, continuing disagreements again become evident. Some of the papers in this volume [IV] tend to imply that the current structure of justice operations is relatively viable and only in need of infusions of more money and trained manpower, while some of the essays here and elsewhere in the criminal justice literature are much less sanguine about existing structures and operations, arguing instead for marked innovations and radical changes in responses to lawbreaking. Then too, some of the preceding pages indicate that some students of the crime problem would advocate

wholesale societal restructuring as the most sensible approach to dealing with crime in modern society. These discordant views are symptomatic of broader quarrels about the most sensible or promising approaches to crime control that are currently raging across the United States. Also, they point up the inadequacies of existing knowledge on crime and its control, which preclude unequivocal conclusions about the most efficacious crime control strategies.

The preceding paragraphs have hinted at some of the complex and profound quarrels and issues that characterize the struggling fields of criminal justice education and practice. These are thorny issues that create a good deal of anxiety and concern, but they are at the same time the stuff out of which the spirit of intellectual excitement is created. Hopefully, the pages of this volume [IV] will have stimulated the reader to struggle further with these key concerns.

V. OTHER PRODUCTS

The seven member institutions and the Coordinator's Office produced a number of additional materials during the three years which LEAA funded the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium. For example, Portland State University obtained a separate contract from LEAA during 1975-76, through which its staff assisted the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of LEAA in the planning for the national effort in juvenile diversion. Portland State University staff members produced a number of documents dealing with juvenile diversion during the course of that contract. In much the same way, staff at Michigan State University and at Arizona State University entered into a number of advisory and research relationships with criminal justice agencies in the regions in which those universities are located, as also did Portland State University. The University of Nebraska at Omaha staff members also engaged in these lines of activity, as well as in producing a number of scholarly and research papers on police organization and kindred topics. Then too, a number of useful, specific products of these kinds were developed at Northeastern University, the University of Maryland, and Eastern Kentucky University. Information about these various products can be obtained from the Project Directors at the individual universities. However, let us take note of a few of the

products of the member institutions and Coordinator's Office of the National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

The Arizona State University staff engaged in a wide range of research and consultative activities, particularly in cooperation with regional criminal justice agencies. Arizona State University co-produced a massive criminal justice bibliography, described in detail later in this report. Other endeavors include:

The Problem of Crime in Arizona--How Do We Solve It? Research Report for the Arizona Academy (Sponsor of Arizona Town Halls) prepared by faculty members of the Center of Criminal Justice: Thomas D. Kennedy, Thomas V. Schade, Rudolph J. Gerber, and John C. Mowen.

The 27th Town Hall held in October 1975 at the Grand Canyon was convened to "develop a series of recommendations which will help to solve the problem of crime in Arizona . . . (through the study of the entire criminal justice system)." The purpose of the report was to provide for the Town Hall participants "adequate background information from which to launch their detailed discussions."

An Assessment of the Attitudes of Criminal Justice Personnel in Arizona Regarding Higher Education, by Gilbert H. Bruns, I. Gayle Shuman, and John C. Mowen, July 1974.

A survey to ascertain the attitudes of criminal justice personnel in the State of Arizona regarding higher education was conducted in order to determine: (a) possible philosophies of education for the newly-formed Center of Criminal Justice at Arizona State University, (b) types of academic courses desired, and (c) the potential demand for courses

in higher education by criminal justice personnel. It was found that those respondents with college degrees tended to be more favorable towards higher education than those with two years of college or less. Those with two years of college or less generally supported higher education but appeared to possess ambivalent attitudes towards it. All categories of respondents supported the concept of a bachelor's degree program at Arizona State University.

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

A program of "mini-grants" funded and supervised by the Criminal Justice Coordinating Center resulted in the following projects, among others:

Conference on Women in the Criminal Justice System, Director, Bette D. Fox

Court Administration Conference, Director, Donald W. Skinner (to evaluate the advisability of establishing a court administration option at the graduate level).

Conference on Privacy and Criminal Justice Data Banks, Director, James W. Fox (in cooperation with and funded by the Kentucky Endowment for the Humanities, the Kentucky Educational Association, and the Kentucky Civil Liberties Union).

Conference on Correctional Food Service Delivery, Director, Shirley Snarr

Conference on Coping with School Disciplinary Problems*, Director, Elizabeth Horn

Jury Study*, Co-Directors, James W. Fox and Robert Bray

A Study of Job Attitudes Regarding Organizational Variables for a Correctional Food Service*, Director, Shirley Snarr

Comparative Study of Values of Individuals in Components of the Kentucky Criminal Justice System*, Director, Thomas Reed

College Student Victimization Study, Director, James W. Fox

Comparative Criminal Justice Systems--Thailand and the U.S.*, Director, Richard Snarr

Search and Seizure--Applicability of Student Rights*, Director, Robert Bagby

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

A number of papers and research reports were produced by project members at Michigan State University, including the following:

Women Offenders and the Criminal Justice System: A Bibliography, prepared by John F. Brooks, Research Assistant, September 1975.

Delphi Study of Issues in Adult Corrections, prepared for the Michigan Council of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Ralph G. Lewis, October 1975.

Co-Ed Correctional Institutions, Ralph G. Lewis and John Ortiz Smykla, January 1976.

"Role Congruence and Job Satisfaction: Implications of a Heterogeneous Role Environment for Personnel Practices in a Sheriff's Department," by John K. Hudzik and Jack R. Greene, May 1976, submitted for publication to Journal of Criminal Justice.

"Organizational Identity and Goal Consensus in a Contemporary Sheriff's Department: An Exploratory Inquiry," by John K. Hudzik and Jack R. Greene, February 1976, submitted for publication to Journal of Police Science and Administration.

---

*Reports available from:
Criminal Justice Coordinating Center
College of Law Enforcement
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, Kentucky 40475

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

The Northeastern University program resulted in a large number of research studies and reports dealing with forensic chemistry in criminal justice. A partial listing of these works is provided below:

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

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

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

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

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

"Metallurgical Aspects of Serial Number Recovery," by D. E. Polk and B. C. Giessen, AFTE Journal, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 38, 1975.

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

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

Criminal Justice Planning: An Introduction, by Don C. Gibbons, Joseph L. Thimm, Florence Yospe, and Gerald F. Blake, Jr.

Criminal Justice Planning, which is being published by Prentice-Hall, Inc. (available March 1977), provides an historical evaluation of the state of justice planning from its inception under the federal crime-fighting legislation in the sixties to its present level of functioning. A generous sampling of the commentary that has been provided to date on the problems and major ingredients of planning is examined, along with the authors' explication of the dimensions of planning knowledge that need further development. More specifically, criminal justice efforts in several states are discussed.

Attention is directed to organizational problems that have plagued efforts at justice planning in the past and which promise to continue to complicate the planner's task in the future. The component agencies of the criminal justice "system" often operate with different mandates or tasks which they endeavor to perform. For example, the police view their job as centered about crime reduction and often regard the courts or correctional agencies as working at cross purposes to them. Moreover, the police, courts, and correctional agencies do, in fact, pursue somewhat discordant goals. In addition, the various functionaries within the justice system often exhibit divergent value perspectives

and differing beliefs about crime and criminals, such that it is often difficult to maintain the contention that the criminal justice apparatus in its entirety truly does constitute a system.

Also reviewed is a large share of the literature that has emerged to this point regarding criminal justice planning, in which various conceptual frameworks centering around systems analysis have been put forth. The authors' own conceptual framework for justice planning, which draws heavily from the planning theory literature authored by Friedmann, Kahn, Bolan, and Michael, among others, is presented and adapted to the current needs of the justice system. A discussion of theories and evidence on crime causation, along with findings growing out of evaluative studies of correctional programs, is presented to bolster the limited knowledge base of justice planning.

One chapter of this book zeroes in upon specific planning resources and methodological tools for the justice system planner. These include data sources, system-rates analysis, modeling and simulation techniques, program evaluation methodology, and a number of other tools for the justice system planner.

The analysis in this book avoids technical jargon, esoteric statistical techniques, and the like. This volume is intended to serve as a sourcebook and reference text for criminal justice planners and neophyte planners, most of

whom need to be introduced to the basic literature on planning before moving into more complex areas.

The table of contents is as follows:

Chapter One	The Planning Challenge
Chapter Two	The Current State of Criminal Justice Planning
Chapter Three	Organizational Impediments to Planning
Chapter Four	Some Perspectives on Planning
Chapter Five	A Conceptual Framework for Planning: Core Knowledge
Chapter Six	A Conceptual Framework for Planning: Planning Principles
Chapter Seven	Planning Resources and Methodology
Chapter Eight	Gearing Up for Criminal Justice Planning

Educational Programs, Criminal Justice Manpower Needs, and Directions in Education: Focus on Region X, by Michael De Shane and David B. Griswold, Portland State University, August 1975.

The Portland State University project staff conducted its own manpower study in Region X, independently from the Consortium manpower investigation described earlier. The general content of that manpower report is as follows:

This investigation provides a comprehensive look at the current criminal justice system in Region X with some rough estimates of future manpower needs, in order to attempt to influence the direction of the system in the future. The first part of the report presents a more or less traditional manpower needs assessment for the criminal justice system, using traditional indicators such as population growth

estimates, turnover rates, and past growth trends. The second part of the report provides an analysis of current educational programs engaged in criminal justice education within the region. The third part attempts to establish goals or targets for the criminal justice system in the next two decades and to look at the educational and training programs which will be needed if these goals or targets are to be reached. For example, trends in diversion programs, alternatives to incarceration, and misdemeanant programs, to name only a few, are examined and the types of persons needed to manage some of these programs are discussed. The purpose of these kinds of presentations is not only to provide information on future manpower needs in the region as it is presently constituted but also to provide a direction for criminal justice planners, educators, and policy makers in the future. Examination of future or emergent areas of responsibility for the criminal justice system is necessary if planning is to be effective.

The report concludes with recommendations regarding the skills which will be required of future criminal justice personnel. Education and training for future roles should be multidisciplinary in nature so as to provide future professionals with a background in sociology, psychology, economics, [illegible], and policy formation.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

A central thrust of the criminal justice curriculum developed at Portland State University is in the direction of program evaluation methodology and skills. The general area of evaluation methodology to be applied to the assessment and monitoring of a wide variety of social service delivery systems is a very rapidly growing one, involving a burgeoning literature that threatens to outrace one's capacity to keep abreast of it. One of the specific efforts of the Portland State University project in the area of program evaluation was the production of an extremely detailed and comprehensive annotated bibliography on program evaluation. That annotated bibliography is described below. In addition, several other papers and articles dealing with program evaluation were produced by the Portland State University project, including:

"Program Evaluation in Correction," by Don C. Gibbons, Barry D. Lebowitz, and Gerald F. Blake. Crime and Delinquency, 22, April 1976, pp. 309-21.

"Evaluating the Impact of Juvenile Diversion Programs," by Don C. Gibbons and Gerald F. Blake, Crime and Delinquency, 22, October 1976, pp. 441-20.

"The Administrator's Role in Research, Staffing, and Funding: Choosing an Evaluation Team and Anticipating Cost and Time Frame," by Don C. Gibbons, paper presented at the First Annual Conference on Assessment and Evaluation, University of North Dakota, June 21, 1976.

"An Evaluation of the Parrot Creek Ranch Youth Care Facility," by Michael Wiatrowski, project report, Portland State University.

Program Evaluation in Corrections: An Annotated Bibliography, Florence Yospe, ed., Portland State University, 1976.

The contents of this annotated bibliography, most of which have been produced in the past decade, bear witness to the rapid growth of the program evaluation movement in the United States. This literature includes books, monographs, and articles which identify the needs for evaluation and basic problems that are encountered in evaluative endeavors. Additionally, there is a sizable collection of essays and articles which explicate many of the more specific and technical problems encountered in evaluative ventures. Another body of material centers about summaries and assessments of specific program evaluation efforts and a number of persons have tried to collate these investigations and draw conclusions from them. Finally, the program evaluation literature contains a large number of reports of evaluation efforts directed at specific programs. These evaluation projects are of markedly varied quality, so that some are little more than reports of intuitive guesses about program impact, while others represent carefully conducted experimental ventures.

This bibliography is divided into four sections. Section I consists of brief summaries of a large number of texts and essays that are concerned with basic and general problems and issues in program evaluation. Section II summarizes a number of more specific essays and articles dealing with technical problems of evaluation. Section III provides summaries of a number of summary assessments that have

been made about correctional evaluation efforts to date. Finally, Section IV presents a sampling of specific evaluation studies.

A limited number of copies are available from:

National Criminal Justice Education Development Project
Urban Studies Graduate Program
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97207

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

The project staff members at the University of Nebraska at Omaha carried out a large number of projects and studies, a sampling of which is provided in the following listing:

The Urban Police in American History: A Review of the Literature, by Samuel Walker, project report.

Indian Justice Bibliography, submitted for publication to American Council of Planning Libraries as an Exchange Bibliography.

Higher Education Criminal Justice Manpower Study: LEAA Region VIII.

This research was for the purpose of determining the need in Region VIII educational institutions for graduate degree holders in criminal justice.

Manpower Survey of State Planning Agencies in Region VII.

This research was designed to provide basic data regarding future educational requirements for personnel in Criminal Justice State Planning Agencies.

Methodology in Criminal Justice Manpower Forecasting.

This research was a critical review and elaboration of existent approaches to manpower forecasting in criminal

justice. The focus was on alternatives to traditional trend line projections, and the purpose of the study was to determine the parameters which limit the utility of existent forecasts.

A Multifactor Analysis of Criminal Justice Education in the United States.

This study examined a variety of factors hypothesized to affect the structure and content of undergraduate education in criminal justice. The purpose of the study was to provide benchmark data for comparing the curricular trends in the UNO program.

A Taxonomic Approach to Value Orientations in Criminal Justice.

Building on the work of such authors as Miller and Gibbons, this study attempted to systematically categorize and analyze a broad range of value orientations in criminal justice.

Labeling Theory in Juvenile Delinquency: An Evaluation of Empirical Evidence.

Labeling theory has received a great deal of attention as a theoretical explanation of delinquency. Only a modest amount of empirical research has been generated by this theoretical perspective. This study was an evaluation of research findings generated by labeling theory; the primary goal was to discuss systematically the amount of support for the theory.

Criminal Justice as a Component of Community Planning.

This study was aimed at developing a model for incorporating criminal justice planning into community planning. The focus was on incorporating a variety of fragmented planning efforts and processes into a generic model of community planning.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Criminal Justice: A Multidisciplinary Bibliography, National Criminal Justice Educational Development Project, Portland State University, and Center of Criminal Justice, Arizona State University, Florence Yospe (ed.), September 1975.

This bibliography was developed jointly by Arizona State University and Portland State University in response to a need for a comprehensive and detailed multidisciplinary compilation of available books and government documents that relate to the emerging field of criminal justice. Professional journals and magazine sources were not included due to manpower constraints and the recognition that many of the more significant articles and statements relating to criminal justice are contained in recently published books.

The bibliography is not intended to be viewed as a final product in itself but as a beginning step in the continuing process of making available the most recent and relevant publications. It is divided into four general substantive areas: (1) criminal justice, (2) law enforcement, (3) corrections, and (4) courts. The majority of the works are included under the heading criminal justice. In this area,

titles are included from such diverse fields as anthropology, economics, education, history, law, political science, psychology, the physical sciences, public administration, and sociology. Reference for such topics as juvenile delinquency, women in crime, drugs, and many others can also be gleaned by perusal of this particular section. The other three areas--law enforcement, corrections, and courts--while more specific in nature, also reflect the use of information and research from many related and divergent sources.

The sources for the bibliography were legion. Bibliographies from the faculty at Portland State University, Florida State University, Michigan State University, San Jose State University, and the University of California at Berkeley, in addition to the Index of Books in Print, catalogs from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, lists from publishers, and reviews from the New York Review of Books, Psychology Today, and the Atlantic Monthly, provided the editor with reference material.

A limited number of copies are available from:

Center of Criminal Justice
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

PROGRAM CATALOGS AND CAREERS BROCHURE

The Consortium Coordinator's Office at Arizona State University produced two criminal justice program catalogs and a criminal justice careers brochure. One of the catalogs, the Criminal Justice Graduate Programs Catalog, was generated to assist the

National Criminal Justice Educational Consortium and other institutions in criminal justice higher education in their curriculum development efforts and to accommodate a growing number of undergraduate students who are looking toward graduate education in criminal justice. The second, the Criminal Justice Undergraduate Programs Catalog, was prepared to serve somewhat the same purpose for undergraduate criminal justice education and students seeking information about such programs. Brief program descriptions are provided on 282 schools known to offer baccalaureate degrees in areas related to criminal justice, and a table listing such schools by state indicates in which particular areas the degrees are offered, as well as in what departments the programs are housed.

The careers brochure outlined the range of occupational opportunities available in criminal justice, particularly for undergraduate degree recipients. The brochure was widely distributed across the country and was well received, apparently filling a strongly felt need within criminal justice education programs.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20531

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, $300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
JUS-436

THIRD CLASS

END