

*Evaluation News is produced by BJA's Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement at the Justice Research and Statistics Association.*

Send questions and comments to [bjaeval@jrjsa.org](mailto:bjaeval@jrjsa.org)

Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)  
Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement at the Justice Research and Statistics Association  
777 N. Capitol St., NE, Suite 801  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 842-9330

*To subscribe or unsubscribe to Evaluation News, send an email with your request to [bjaeval@jrjsa.org](mailto:bjaeval@jrjsa.org)*

This project is supported by Grant No. 2010-D2-BX-K028 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not represent the official position or policies of the United States Department of Justice. Privacy Statement and Disclaimer: [www.usdoj.gov/privacy-file.htm](http://www.usdoj.gov/privacy-file.htm).

*Evaluation News provides information on the BJA Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement, promotes the exchange of information on evaluation and performance measurement, and publicizes criminal justice research and evaluation reports for use by state and local criminal justice agencies.*

### Law Enforcement

Bowers et al. conducted a systematic review of geographically focused policing initiatives to determine the extent to which they displace crime to other places or diffuse benefits (lead to crime reductions elsewhere). Previous reviews of this research were largely consistent in finding that displacement was often not observed, and when it was, it tended to be less than the gains achieved by the intervention. For a study to be included in this review, the following conditions had to be satisfied: It must have evaluated a focused policing intervention, used some quantitative measure of crime and/or disorder, and reported original research findings, and the intervention had to be geographically focused on a local area (smaller than a city or region). Sixteen studies were included in the formal meta-analysis. This meta-analysis produced several important findings. First, these initiatives were associated with significant reductions in crime and disorder. Second, overall changes in catchment areas were non-significant but there was a trend in favor of a diffusion of benefit. The displacement analyses suggest changes in catchment areas exceeded those that might be expected in the absence of intervention, and that a diffusion of crime control benefit, rather than crime displacement, appears to be the more likely outcome. The article, "Spatial displacement and diffusion of benefits among geographically focused policing initiatives: A meta-analytical review," was published in the *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. The abstract is available at: <http://www.springerlink.com/content/m23k8jw21529461g/>

### Information Sharing

The United Kingdom Home Office conducted a process evaluation of an initiative designed to encourage data sharing between hospital emergency departments and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs). CSPs were created to bring agencies and communities together to tackle crime and disorder in their communities. The initiative was designed to improve the collection and sharing of depersonalized emergency department assault data with CSPs. It is believed that this effort will provide a fuller and more accurate picture of the violent crime in local areas, and, by allowing a more targeted police/partnership response, contribute to reductions in violence. This report is based on interviews regarding the implementation of this initiative in ten emergency departments located in the Southeast of England. It identifies characteristics regarding the setup and working arrangements as well as barriers to the collection, analysis, and use of data. The study revealed that hospitals varied widely in how they implemented their data sharing and many interviewees described taking additional steps to ensure that these efforts did not breach existing privacy protocols. Some of the barriers to data collection identified in the report included the use of paper-based data collection systems, physical location of data collection (i.e., reception versus more private areas), and high staff turnover. Further only three of ten CSPs reported using the data at the time of the interviews. The most commonly identified reasons for failing to use the data were lack of a

Useful resources for criminal justice program evaluation and performance measurement are available at the BJA Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement web site: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/evaluation>.

data analysis partner, low number of assault cases, and lack of accuracy and/or insufficient detail regarding the assault. Recommendations included: concentrating efforts on improving the accuracy of data related to the location where the assault occurred, developing resources that demonstrate the usefulness of the data, and conducting further research to better understand local efforts and how the emergency department data can enhance knowledge of the nature of violent assaults. The report “Process evaluation of data sharing between Emergency Departments and Community Safety Partnerships in the South East,” is available at: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/science-research-statistics/research-statistics/crime-research/horr46/?view=Standard&pubID=861758>

### **Other Reports**

The Center for Court Innovation recently released a report to assist prosecutors with choosing performance indicators for their community prosecution initiatives. In this report, the authors synthesize the various goals of community prosecution initiatives, and the objectives associated with these goals, and suggest several performance measures that can be used to evaluate whether those goals and objectives are met. The four goals identified are: community engagement, problem solving, effective case administration, and interagency partnerships. For more information on the objectives and performance indicators, see: “Choosing Performance Indicators for Your Community Prosecution Initiative” at [http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/Choosing\\_Performance\\_Indicators.pdf](http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/Choosing_Performance_Indicators.pdf)

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) released the latest update on its effort to calculate the return on investment to taxpayers from evidence-based prevention and intervention programs as directed by the legislature. Its approach included: systematically assessing the evidence, calculating cost and benefit, measuring the riskiness of conclusions, and, where possible, providing a portfolio of policy options. In this 2011 update, mental health courts, correctional industries in prison, drug treatment in prison, and the Dangerously Mentally Ill Offenders program were identified as the adult criminal justice programs with the greatest rate of return on investment. The report, “Return on Investment: Evidence-based options to improve statewide outcomes,” is available at: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/11-07-1201.pdf>

### **Tip of the Month**

Which evaluator should I hire?

Organizations typically hire program evaluators when they lack the necessary skills, experience, resources, and/or time to do an evaluation. Of course, organizations want to hire a qualified evaluator to conduct their evaluation. When selecting an evaluator, an organization should consider an evaluator’s formal education, experience, evaluation philosophy, and communication skills. When assessing an evaluator’s formal education, the focus should be on his/her knowledge of research methods. For more information, see JRSA’s publication “Hiring and Working with an Evaluator.” <http://www.jrsa.org/pubs/juv-justice/evaluator.pdf>