

# 1998 ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION:

## VIEWING CRIME AND JUSTICE IN A COLLABORATIVE PERSPECTIVE

July 26-29, 1998

C.3

178241

### SUMMARY OF BJA SESSIONS

---

Bureau of Justice Assistance	<b>JRSA</b>	Justice Research and Statistics Association
810 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.		777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 801
Washington, D.C. 20531		Washington, D.C. 20002
202.514.6278		202.842.9330 FAX 202.842.9329
<a href="http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA">www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA</a>		<a href="http://www.jrsa.org">www.jrsa.org</a>

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report on the 1998 Annual Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation is a product of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) as part of the State Evaluation Development Program, which is coordinated by the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA).

The two plenary sessions entitled *The Changing Role of Research in Helping Collaborations Work* and *Research and Evaluation Partnerships: How Has Collaboration Worked in Domestic Violence Partnerships?* were cosponsored by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and BJA, as was the panel *Responding to Crime in Indian Country*.

The Justice Research and Statistics Association prepared this document under the direction of Joan C. Weiss, Executive Director. The JRSA staff working on this publication, under the supervision of Director of Special Projects Michael Connelly, were Nancy Michel, Laura Parisi, Marylinda Stawasz, and Kate Wagner.

This document was prepared by the Justice Research and Statistics Association, under grant number 95-DD-BX-K011, awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed 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.

**1998 ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH AND  
EVALUATION**

**July 26-29, 1998**



Collaboration among criminal justice researchers and practitioners marked the 1998 Annual Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation: Viewing Crime and Justice in a Collaborative Perspective, July 26-29, 1998. The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) sponsored the conference through the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), and other OJP offices.

BJA-sponsored plenary sessions, panels, and workshops featured topics such as evaluation of treatment programs, crime in Indian country, making streets safe for juveniles, evaluation frameworks, the hate crime epidemic, development of performance measures, violence prevention, Byrne Evaluation Partnerships, partnerships among Byrne State Administrative Agencies (SAAs) and state Statistical Analysis Centers (SACs), and confirmation of effective programs. A brief summary of these BJA events is below.

## **PANELS**

### **Panel--Responding to Crime in Indian Country**

*Moderator:* Winifred L. Reed, Social Science Analyst, NIJ Office of Research and Evaluation

*Presenters:* Eric Kenneth Gross, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Criminal Justice, Temple University, "Navajo Approaches to Reducing Family and Community Disorder: A Preliminary Evaluation/Assessment of Peacemaking"

Richard Nichols, Vice President, ORBIS Associates, Washington, D.C., "Initial Findings of the Evaluation of Tribal Strategies Against Violence (TSAV) Initiative"

Stewart Wakeling, Senior Program Associate, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, "Culture, Sovereignty, and Community Policing in Indian Country"

*Respondent:* Philip C. Baridon, Senior Policy Analyst, Office of Policy and Management Analysis, Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice

In a culture emphasizing individual and group harmony such as on the Navajo Reservation, according to Eric Kenneth Gross, the primary research question is, how effective is peacemaking as a process in reducing violence within the family and the community, compared to the inconsistent results of conventional corrections? He used focus groups of peacemakers, justice administrators, and process participants and surveys in English and Navajo to gather data on perspectives of the Navajo peacemaking process. This process differs from other forms of mediative or restorative justice in that it perceives disorder as context specific and focuses on problem-solving and participant transformation, with no formal convictions. Participants saw the process as fairer than standard Family Court and settled at higher rates; they also felt it provided a forum for their views and feelings.

Richard Nichols described the Tribal Strategies Against Violence (TSAV) Initiative as being intended to empower American Indian communities through their tribal and other institutions to implement locally designed, collaborative, and comprehensive strategies to reduce reservation crime, violence, and substance abuse. He designed this evaluation, still in its initial stages, to (1) document how TSAV approaches have evolved; (2) document how sites have implemented their comprehensive strategies; (3) analyze and report on factors that have either negatively or positively affected the evolution of the initiative among different sites; and (4) provide evaluation findings useful for local decision-makers at the tribal level as well as other criminal justice stakeholders and practitioners.

Program strategies included program activities for youth, alcohol/substance abuse prevention, gang awareness and violence prevention, changes in tribal codes and courts, conflict and anger management skill training, partnerships in sharing data and community policing, and services to families. Initial data collection site visits to North Dakota, Oklahoma, Montana, and Michigan occurred between December 1997 and April 1998.

Stewart Wakeling presented an overview of policing in “Indian country.” His study had several components: (1) exploration of policing and its history on American Indian reservations; (2) identification and explanation of policing strategies that work and do not work on reservations; (3) exploration of the role of “fit” between tribal culture and policing strategies in policing effectiveness; and (4) discovery of unique cultural, economic, and political circumstances on reservations that might bear on the successful implementation of community policing.

The “typical” police department on Indian reservations has the following problems: (1) large geographical jurisdictions, (2) old and over-used infrastructure, (3) low officer salaries, (4) underreporting of crimes, (5) inattention to regional or national trends, (6) increasing workloads, (7) crimes directly or indirectly related to alcohol, and (8) high residential mobility with subsequent disorder and decay.

As respondent, Philip Baridon agreed with panelists and added other concerns. These included: (1) the lack of double jeopardy, since tribes are sovereign; (2) 14 crimes designated as federal, such as murder or armed robbery, which are not processed in the U.S. District Courts; and (3) Public Law 280, effective in six states, which mandates state provision of criminal justice services on the reservations.

### **Panel--Making Streets Safe for Juveniles: State and Local Evaluation Results**

*Moderator:* Kellie J. Dressler, Social Science Program Specialist, OJJDP Research and Program Development Division

*Presenters:* Harold Becker, Professor and Graduate Coordinator, Department of Criminal Justice, California State University at Long Beach, “Preliminary Study of Juvenile and Police Perceptions of Community Policing in Four Southern California Counties”

Diana Brensilber, Director of Research and Evaluation, Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety, “Evaluating Effectiveness of Police-Involved After School Programs”

Susan Pennell, Director, Criminal Justice Research Division, San Diego Association of Governments, “State Challenge Grants Challenge the Evaluator”

Harold Becker completed a one-year study of 133 California Law Enforcement Service Areas (LESAs) participating in community policing. Of the 133, only 6 interacted programmatically with youths, and those 6 collaborated in surveying program recipients, including community residents and businesses, the police, and youths involved in community policing activities. Although done for “quick and easy” results, the surveys did find substantial differences in perceptions of effectiveness among participants. While 100% of police respondents believed community policing effective with youths, the percentage range for youths stating effectiveness in the survey areas was only 30%-50%. The presenter concluded that police did not understand the youths well, that old programs were no longer working, and community policing was not effective and, in fact, met resistance.

Diana Brensilber reviewed results from an evaluation of the Cops and Kids program in Massachusetts. Reports and events raising doubts about Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) programming led to a call for formal evaluation. The Cops and Kids program consisted of after-school programs that were comprehensive and community-based and took place in positive, healthy environments. The programs included a range of activities from sports to computers to guest speakers, depending on the school's location. Its major purpose was to create positive quality of life for local kids, to increase the amount of interaction between kids and law enforcement, and to keep kids off the street.

Evaluators performed program monitoring as well as process and impact evaluations. The process evaluation included direct observation, mandatory evaluation reports, and information sessions among program leaders. The impact evaluation had not yet been concluded but used pre- and post-program surveys of satisfaction levels of participating youths for data analysis. As a preliminary finding, the presenter noted that 90% of participants remained involved in the program in the succeeding school year.

Susan Pennell stated that state challenge grant programs through the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program have targeted serious juvenile offenders and at-risk youth and have tailored family-focused seminars providing continuity of service to end criminal or at-risk behavior early in the offender's career. These multidisciplinary services link the police department, schools, and other social agencies. Among the outcomes of these programs, according to the presenter, are: (1) self-sufficient families, (2) community support, (3) increased employment, (4) less drug activity, and (5) better performance in schools.

Several new issues have developed around the programs: (1) probation administrators are now working on collaborations that give them new responsibilities; (2) more services are being contracted out to other agencies; and (3) changes have been made in roles for the probation officers from enforcer to facilitator and from confrontational to relational attitudes.

Conclusions drawn from the grants evaluations were that (1) program designs were not easily adapted; (2) interdisciplinary services had no history of communication; (3) many resources were depleted; (4) confidentiality rules made sharing data difficult; (5) different agencies had different resource realities; and (6) failure to create a common data base made it difficult to show that competing programs were targeting the same kids.

## **Panel--The Hate Crime Epidemic in Our Community**

*Moderator:* Jennifer Knobe, Program Manager, BJA Adjudication Branch

*Presenters:* John R. Firman, Director of Research and Analysis, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Alexandria, VA, "IACP's Summit on Hate Crime in America"

Luis Garcia, Director of Research and Evaluation, Boston Police Department, "Overview of Research in Progress on the Psychological and Behavioral Effects of Violent Hate Crime Victimization"

Jack Levin, Director, Program for the Study of Violence in Society, Department of Sociology, Northeastern University, "Is the Hate Crime 'Epidemic' Only a Social Construction?"

Jack McDevitt, Co-Director, Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research, College of Criminal Justice, Northeastern University, "Hate Crime Characteristics and Limitations of Available Data"

John Firman asserted that police needed to take a leadership role in the hate crime problem through coalition-building with advocates, schools, teachers, students, and the community. He advocated training for law enforcement officers on how to identify and react properly to hate crimes, with special emphasis on effective responses for victims.

Luis Garcia discussed current work on an NIJ-funded project studying the psychological and behavioral after-effects of hate crimes. An initial survey of victims of hate and non-hate crimes from 1992 to 1997 yielded only a 1% response rate. Therefore, an additional 100 surveys have been disseminated. These surveys include questions on simple assault-related hate crimes as well as aggravated assault.

Jack Levin stated that disparate legal definitions have made comparison of hate crime statistics across states difficult, leading some to argue that hate crime is a "social construction" and has not really increased in recent years. The presenter, however, stated that the number of hate crimes likely did increase in the 1980s and 1990s. While noting the current concern about possible inflation of statistics reported by advocacy groups, he also reported that some groups, such as the Anti-Defamation League, have announced declines in the number of hate crimes. The debate exemplified the need for a better reporting system and a collaborative effort to collect hate crime statistics.

Jack McDevitt also discussed the current state of hate crime statistics. To demonstrate the difficulty of getting hate crime reports, he noted that from the beginning of the Hate Crime Statistics Act in 1990 through 1996, of the 11,000 agencies reporting statistics to the FBI, only 17% said that they had at least one incident of a hate crime in their state. He stated that we do know the following about hate crime: (1) its motivation is largely racial; (2) the typical offender is a white male; (3) the majority of incidences happen at residences; (4) the types of acts include vandalism, intimidation, and aggravated and simple assault; and (5) hate crimes are often random acts.

All panelists recommended that more research be done on victim impact and on offender typology/motivation. They also stressed the need to understand how messages about racial and ethnic issues get sent to youths.



## **Panel--Clearing the Air in Violence Prevention: Blueprints for Implementation**

*Moderator:* Delbert S. Elliot, Director, Program on Problem Behavior and the Center for the Study of Prevention of Violence, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado at Boulder

*Presenters:* Patricia Chamberlain, Clinical Director, Oregon Social Learning Center, Eugene, OR, "Treatment Foster Care: A Community-Based Model for Chronic Juvenile Offenders"

Scott W. Henggeler, Professor, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, "Multisystematic Treatment of Serious Juvenile Offenders: Long-Term Outcomes"

David L. Olds, Professor, Pediatrics, Psychiatry, and Preventative Medicine, Health Sciences Center, University of Colorado at Denver, "Prevention of Juvenile Crime and Emergent Use of Substances with Prenatal and Infancy Home Visitation by Nurses"

Each presentation represented an exemplary violence prevention program recognized by the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. The three programs shared four elements: (1) All were grounded in empirical research and focused on known causes of delinquency; (2) All involved intensive, high quality, multidimensional interventions; (3) All included rigorous long-term evaluations; and (4) All had effectiveness rates of 30%-40% in terms of nonrecidivism.

Scott Henggeler described a multisystematic treatment program based on the known determinants of antisocial behavior. Such treatment uses a family preservation model, providing treatment where the problem exists (in homes or schools), and addresses individual, family, school, and other factors. The treatment, averaging five families per therapist, were seen through three replications to lower criminal activity, incarceration, and adolescent emotional distress by building parental capacity and emotional bonds.

Patricia Chamberlain discussed a treatment foster care program that recruited families for juveniles who have already been removed from their homes into group/residential treatment centers. The core components of the program included daily structure and support, weekly individual treatment, schooling, close supervision, consistent discipline, skill building, weekly family treatment, home visits, and instruction in behavior management. It also included ongoing supervision of parents, foster parents, and the juveniles.

A recent five-year study involved 80 randomly assigned males, 14 years old at intake and with five or more felonies. A one-year follow-up showed significant decreases in arrests and self-reported crimes for the treatment groups as well as lower runaway and rearrest rates during treatment, compared to a control group at a residential center. The presenter concluded that the program worked due to supervision, discipline, and building of relationships with adults.

David Olds delineated a program of prenatal and infancy home visitation by nurses. The program, tested in three states, targeted pregnancy outcomes, child health development, and parental life course development. Its goal was to have a positive effect on preterm delivery and low birth weight, child abuse and neglect, child injuries, conduct disorder, neurodevelopment impairment, school failure, and crime and delinquency. Results of the evaluation, done 15 years after treatment, showed significant reductions in child maltreatment among poor, unmarried teens; in emergency room encounters with children 0-4 years of age; and in subsequent pregnancy. A significant increase in employment among the mothers was also seen. An economic impact study indicated that the costs of the interventions were recovered before the child reached the age of 4 through reductions of welfare and juvenile justice costs. OJJDP is

presently funding development of a small-scale community-wide replication program to try to move the program to national scale.

### **Panel--BJA's Byrne Evaluation Partnership Program: Status Report and Future**

**Moderator:** Beverlee Venell, Director, Criminal Justice Services Division, Oregon State Police, Salem, OR

**Presenters:** Haiou He, Senior Research Analyst, Health Division, Oregon Department of Human Resources, Portland, OR, "Statewide Evaluation Strategy Development for Juvenile Violence Prevention Programs Funded by Byrne Formula Grants"  
James F. Nelson, Principal Program Research Specialist, Division of Criminal Justice Services, Office of Justice Systems Analysis, Albany, NY, "Tools for the Evaluation and Management of Youth Courts (TEAM YC)"  
Barbara L. Nicholson, Professor, School of Social Work, Salem State College, Salem, MA, and  
Angela Genovese, Project Coordinator, Flashpoint Evaluation, School of Social Work, Salem State College, Salem, MA, "Using Media Literacy to Reach At-Risk Adolescents in the Juvenile Justice System: A Qualitative Evaluation"

James Nelson demonstrated New York's "TEAM YC," an online case management system developed for state youth courts. The system accurately recorded or scheduled offender characteristics, court decisions, sentence schedules, community service and classroom participation sentences, and phone contacts. Future plans for the system include use for extensive evaluations and report writing. The long-term goals of the system are to decrease recidivism and delinquency, increase attachment of youths to social institutions, evaluate impacts by linking arrest data, and distribute the youth court concept more broadly.

Haiou He described Oregon's priorities for juvenile violence prevention programs, including: (1) school-based violence prevention programs, (2) first-time offender programs, and (3) services for repeat, violent juvenile offenders. Related agencies in Oregon formed a partnership using Byrne funding to implement and evaluate benchmarked juvenile violence prevention goals of reducing the number of youths entering the juvenile justice system, the number of repeat offenders, and the number of youths entering the adult system. RFPs for programs approved by the partnership required evaluation components, including evaluability, planning, and capacity.

Barbara Nicholson and Angela Genovese reported on an evaluation of *Flashpoint: Life Skills Through the Lens of Media Literacy*, an educational curriculum designed to enable youth in the juvenile justice system to deconstruct violent, unrealistic, and harmful media messages through development of media literacy skills and critical thinking skills. The result of a partnership between the Salem State College School of Social Work and the Essex County District Attorney's Office of Massachusetts, the Flashpoint Program had 53 juveniles, ages 13-17, from three divisions of the state juvenile justice system, view 12 90-minute excerpts of movies and taped interviews of juveniles in detention facilities. The participants maintained a logbook to record television shows watched and the media images perceived.

Of the 53 who started, 12 girls and 21 boys completed the program. The program evaluation consisted of both qualitative and quantitative components, including in-depth interviews, participant observation, case studies, pre- and post-tests, and time interval follow-ups. As a result of the Flashpoint Program, the presenters concluded that participants (1) understood better the pervasiveness, influence, and monetary agenda of media; (2) felt the greatest benefits of the program were derived from discussion and interaction with their peers; (3) reported increased critical thinking when viewing films, television, and advertisements; and (4) integrated the concepts of conflict avoidance and impulse control.

## **Panel--Confirming Effective Programs: Results from State and Local Evaluations**

*Moderator:* Nancy M. Ware, Director, BJA Discretionary Grant Programs Division

*Presenters:* Edward I. Byrnes, Research Analyst, Social Research Institute, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, "Utah Day Reporting Center: Success with Alternative Incarceration"

Michael W. Finigan, President, Northwest Professional Consortium, Inc., West Linn, OR, "Outcomes of Multnomah County S.T.O.P. Drug Diversion Program"

David S. Metzger, Associate Professor, Center for Studies of Addiction, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, "Evaluation of School-Based Probation in Pennsylvania"

Edward Byrnes reported on an evaluation of the Utah Day Reporting Center in Salt Lake City that targeted hard-to-serve probationers and parolees. The program included counseling and tutoring as well as intensive supervision, something patients had rarely experienced before. The evaluation included both pre- and posttreatment activities and examined each patient's criminal history records to determine recidivism rates. Duration of participation and discharge service were key indicators of successful nonrecidivism. Patients with successful discharges demonstrated significantly improved rates of nonrecidivism, compared to those with unsuccessful discharges.

Michael Finigan discussed the Multnomah County S.T.O.P. (Sanction-Treatment-Opportunity-Progress) Drug Diversion Program, using one of the oldest drug courts in the nation which has an extensive historical data base. An evaluation demonstrated that in addition to treatment and testing, the active, direct, and long-term involvement of the drug court judge contributed substantially to the court's success. The success of the program indicated the potential for extension throughout the nation.

David Metzger described school-based probation in Pennsylvania, a community-focused approach providing police officers to school buildings to supervise directly the juvenile offenders on probation. This configuration allowed greater contact with the offender's family and more involvement in the offender's life. The program evaluation examined events 18 months after the program in 76 randomly selected cases; it found that the offenders had fewer new criminal charges compared to a matched group of offenders not receiving treatment and that the overall program was cost-effective.

## **Panel--Partnership in Action: Collaboration between SAAs and SACs**

*Moderator:* Michael Connelly, Project Manager, Justice Research and Statistics Association, Washington, D.C.

*Presenters:* Richard Moore, Administrator, Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning, Statistical Analysis Center (SAC), Des Moines, IA, "Iowa Partnerships" Douglas Hoffman, Manager, Statistical Analysis Center (SAC), Bureau of Statistics and Policy Research, Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, Harrisburg, PA, "Pennsylvania Evaluation Research"

Robert C. Uhlenkott, Director, Statistical Analysis Center (SAC), Idaho Department of Law Enforcement, Meridian, ID, "Synergies from the Collaboration between the ISAC and ISAA"

Richard Moore described his collaborations as Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) Director in Iowa with the state administering agency (SAA), the Governor's Alliance on Substance Abuse. They collaborated in three ways: (1) through SAA's planning and administrative activities; (2) through system improvement and development; and (3) through evaluation. Examples of activities in these areas included development of data indicators, audits of the state criminal history record system, creation of performance measures for multijurisdictional drug task forces, and evaluations of the state juvenile justice system. The presenter recommended that for

successful collaborations, SACs should broaden their horizons and do what other agencies need and SAAs should get associated with the SAC and recognize the wealth of information that SACs can access.

Douglas Hoffman noted that the SAC and the SAA resided in the same agency in Pennsylvania but did not interact significantly until funding and pressure from the state legislature and BJA brought them together. They began with impact evaluations on multijurisdictional drug task forces and on community policing. Increased experience made them confront basic evaluation questions such as whether and with whom to outsource, whether to use grants or contracts, and what criteria to emphasize, such as cost-effectiveness, in RFPs. Today in Pennsylvania an Evaluation Advisory Committee staffed by the SAC has been established with representatives of the many components of the state criminal justice system. This committee helps to develop the evaluation agenda and state priorities and uses Byrne monies for funding.

Robert Uhlenkott noted that evaluation responsibilities in Idaho were transferred from the SAA to the SAC in 1995, but limited funding limits evaluations. Funded evaluations of Byrne programs emphasized self-evaluations following the BJA protocol; one or two major evaluations were done annually. The SAA benefitted from the collaboration through SAC expertise on programs and cost-effectiveness; the SAC benefitted through better relationships with agencies and through added data sources unavailable in the past. The SAA also improved its ability to diffuse learned knowledge in order to replicate successful programs statewide.

## **WORKSHOPS**

### **Workshop--Evaluating Treatment Programs: Overcoming Obstacles and Producing Useful Information**

*Presenters:* Kenneth D. Robinson, President, Correctional Counseling, Inc.  
Douglas C. McDonald, Senior Associate, Law and Public Policy Area, Abt Associates, Inc.

The presenters focused on areas of substance abuse treatment still needing research through randomized experiments. They put forward several questions for additional study, including: (1) how effective are various treatment types; (2) what treatments are most cost-effective; (3) what treatments are right for different types of offenders; (4) what dose or duration of treatment is most effective; (5) what is the relationship between treatment and where offenders are in their larger careers of drug use; (6) which works best--aftercare or in-prison treatment; and (7) what are the relationships among program effectiveness, offender motivation, and legal coercion.

Among the problems conducting these experiments are: (1) testing prisoners and parolees for drug use; (2) getting offenders to tell the truth to staff; (3) weak experimental designs; and (4) creating effective collaboration among practitioners and researchers. The presenters emphasized the need for training in collaboration for both practitioners and researchers and demonstrated a collaboration success in nine Massachusetts prisons showing improvements in nonrecidivism among treatment recipients in a program over a nine-year period.

### **Workshop--Evaluation Framework to Determine Effective State and Local Programs**

*Presenters:* Robert A. Kirchner, Chief, Program Evaluation, BJA Planning and Policy Division  
Douglas Young, Senior Research Associate, Vera Institute of Justice

Robert Kirchner and Douglas Young asserted that there is no bad information when it comes to evaluation since even information showing failures and obstacles is a step in the right direction. Dependent on state and local agencies for program information, BJA promotes evaluation in several ways: (1) through its "Effective Programs" initiative, (2) through creation of the BJA Evaluation Web site, and (3) through its sponsorship of the annual evaluation conference.

The presenters advocated adoption of a new utilitarian view of evaluation emphasizing evaluation at the beginning of a program and continuation of the practitioner-evaluator relationship throughout the resulting "bottom-up" process. This process consists of three components: (1) setting the foundation, (2) assessing program integrity (process evaluation), and (3) assessing program outcomes (impact evaluation). The presenters stressed the importance of cost-effective evaluation and the production of innovative solutions to practical evaluation problems. In response to the question of why programs should be evaluated, they said that evaluation sustains programs longitudinally.

### **Workshop--Developing Useful and Reliable Performance Measures**

*Presenters:* Robert D. Taylor, Administrator, Federal and State Grant Unit, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Chicago, IL  
Gregory Robinson, Director, Social Science Research Center, California State University at Fullerton

Robert Taylor stated that evaluation requires articulated goals and objectives with specific performance measures that are unique to the project or area. These measures should be imbedded in the program planning process to indicate implementation success, which means that evaluation must also be part of the planning from the start. Using multijurisdictional drug task forces as his example of how measures are chosen, he asserted that measures are dynamic and can change through dialogue among collaborators. In fact, they must change to remain relevant and effective for the program.

Gregory Robinson argued that evaluation can be done to, for, or with a program and that the latter is what evaluators should strive for. In an era of accountability, mandated outcomes fail by encouraging "client creaming," or taking only clients whose treatment is easy to provide and document. Success for more accurate measures requires staff involvement and accountability in their development. As collaboration with staffs grows, diverse areas come together, requiring common terms and definitions. One model offered by the presenter for common adoption was the "logic model," a simple but effective means to structure programs: condition-->activity-->outcome-->impact.

## PLENARIES

### **Plenary Session--The Changing Role of Research in Helping Collaborations Work**

*Moderator:* Nancy Ware, Director, Discretionary Grant Programs Division, BJA

*Presenters:* David Kennedy, Senior Researcher, Criminal Justice Policy and Management, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University  
J. Phillip Thompson, Associate Professor of Political Science, Columbia University

*Respondents:* Henry L. Gardner, Managing Partner, Gardner, Underwood, and Bacon, Oakland, CA  
Margaret Hamburg, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Following introductory remarks by Jeremy Travis, Director of NIJ, and by Laurie O. Robinson, Assistant Attorney General, OJP, on the importance of collaborative research, especially on neglected topics such as probation, the link between alcohol and crime, sex offenders, and indigent defense, Nancy Ware led panelists on a discussion of needs and concerns in evaluation collaborations. David Kennedy described the growing realization of the need for quality long- and short-term collaborations crafted at the local level and for solid qualitative and quantitative information. Opportunities for such work are numerous, much like initial "gold rush" days, according to Kennedy. He urged researchers and practitioners to take a "common sense approach" to evaluation collaborations and to acknowledge three issues: (1) What is the impact of researchers evaluating their own work? (2) What exactly is going to be evaluated? and (3) What counts as "good methods"?

Phillip Thompson stressed that in data collection responsibility exists before knowledge. Therefore, researchers must understand when dealing with communities that they are complex entities with their own sets of rules, folkways, and capacity for self-organization. They also have complex structures with intricate interactions and communications among agencies, services, and other components. Researchers must be aware of: (1) gender dynamics and abandonment issues; (2) tensions among universities, police departments, and communities; (3) differing value assumptions; (4) the dangers of generalizing from small samples of community members; and (5) the constant nature of change within open communities.

In response to the plenary presenters, Henry Gardner urged collaboration on a grand scale, such as his participation in a partnership of 21 cities, 19 school districts, and 2 counties in California. Gardner regarded all collaboration as hard work and great challenge, especially when the community and researchers have different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Researchers must convince the community that their work has real value, according to Gardner.

Margaret Hamburg concluded the plenary session with the observation that collaborations had to be multidisciplinary and multifaceted. As an example, she pointed to her experience in New York City working as a health professional with criminal justice agencies to address a serious tuberculosis outbreak. Hamburg stressed that complacency may lead to ongoing systemic crises; therefore, ongoing collaborations will likely become necessities.

## **Plenary Session--Research and Evaluation Partnerships: How Has Collaboration Worked in Domestic Violence Partnerships?**

*Moderator:* Noel A. Brennan, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, OJP

*Presenter:* Jeffrey L. Edleson, Professor, School of Social Work, Director, Center against Violence and Abuse, University of Minnesota, "Forced Bonding or Community Collaboration? Partnerships Between Science and Practice in Research on Women Batterings"

*Respondents:* Howard E. Black, Detective, Domestic Violence Unit, Colorado Springs Police Department

Alana Bowman, Supervising Deputy City Attorney, Domestic Violence Prosecution Unit, Los Angeles City Attorney's Office

Barbara J. Hart, Legal Director, Legal Office, Battered Women's Justice Project, Harrisburg, PA

Lawrence L. Hauser, Judge, Bridgeport Superior Court, Bridgeport, CT

Jeffrey Edelson presented several challenges to collaboration: (1) shared control of the research process; (2) time; (3) mistrust of academic disciplines; and (4) researcher skills. He provided examples of four successful collaborations in Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Texas-Pennsylvania. Factors associated with these successes included: (1) researcher involvement with the community; (2) the longevity of the researchers' relationship with the program; and (3) the researchers being part of the community at the ground level. He argued that, in collaborations, attention must be paid to advocacy groups, that the control process must be shared, and that research is not value free but in service of empowerment, social justice, and change. Several strategies exist to resolve problems of collaboration: (1) control of the budget should be shared; (2) collaboration should take place throughout the relationship; (3) incentives should be available for all parties; (4) the research should produce tangible results; and (5) communication should be ongoing. He concluded that successful collaborations benefit all parties involved.

As first respondent, Howard Black pointed to his experience with DVERT (Domestic Violence Emergency Response Team), a multidisciplinary group involved in community education, liaison with community agencies, and training for law enforcement personnel. He stated that collaboration among evaluators, practitioners, and the affected communities was difficult but made a difference with domestic violence victims.

Alana Bowman asserted that prosecutors do not believe or trust statistics or research unless they fit the prosecutors' criteria and perspectives. Researchers must attempt to learn more about prosecutors and their practices and information needs. Reliability to prosecutors is enhanced by collaboration and familiarity with the researchers. She advocated multiagency participation with agreed upon standards based on perpetuation of justice.

Barbara Hart argued that evaluation collaborations must include victim advocacy groups, which are different in purpose from victim assistance groups and which have different measures of success. Current measures must be broadened beyond recidivism rates or police calls answered, according to the respondent, to include quality of life and economic security for victims. Most of all, she asserted, research should not create more barriers for the victims.

Lawrence Hauser concluded for the respondents with his views as a domestic court judge. He stated that most judges want to do the right thing but seldom have the right information; however, they fear evaluation work as compromising their independence. He asserted that knowledge does not have to compromise impartiality and that efforts to get judges to "buy into" evaluation would eventually bring fruitful partnerships.

