Integrating Community-based Research into a Criminal Justice Capstone Course

Theresa Ervin Conover

Published online: 15 Jun 2015.

CrossMark

Click for updates

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Integrating Community-based Research into a Criminal Justice Capstone Course

Theresa Ervin Conover ⓘ

There have been a number of themes influencing teaching approaches in undergraduate education in recent years. These include experiential learning and an emphasis on providing research opportunities to students. Couple these themes with the current emphasis in the criminal justice field for researcher—practitioner collaboration and the confluence points toward a community-based research (CBR) approach. This study discusses CBR pedagogy and provides a specific example of its implementation in a criminal justice capstone course. Student outcomes indicate that CBR is a positive way to integrate collaborative, experiential research opportunities for undergraduate students.

Introduction

Two popular themes in higher education include the need to actively engage students in learning and providing opportunities for undergraduate research. In criminal justice, there is another theme and it emphasizes the importance of researcher—practitioner collaborations concerning evidence-based criminal justice decision-making and practice (Rojek, Smith, & Alpert, 2012). This later emphasis has increased as public sector resources have diminished. The call for researcher—practitioner collaborations can be traced back to the 1967 President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice which also addressed the importance of higher education for criminal justice practitioners. More recently, the International Association for Chiefs of Police and the National Institute of Justice have emphasized this type of collaboration (Backes, 2009; International Association of Chiefs of Police [IACP], n.d.).

Many pedagogical approaches exist to provide students the opportunity for "hands-on" learning experiences, including, but not limited to community-based research (CBR), participatory research, action oriented research, service learning, problem-based learning, studio pedagogy, practice-based education, experiential learning, collaborative learning, community-engaged scholarship, active learning, engaged learning theory, and situated learning. Certain pedagogies tend to be somewhat discipline focused.

One way to bring together these themes is to partner universities with criminal justice agencies to provide resources and expertise. In this study, a local law enforcement agency (practitioner) utilized the resources of a local university (researcher) to address questions about citizen satisfaction with the police and the allocation of patrol resources. The call for researcher—practitioner collaboration generally involves larger scale projects, such as partnering for the application of grant funds or evaluation research. The current example represents a smaller effort implemented within the context of a Criminal Justice Capstone course. The course provided students the opportunity to actively engage in the research process which included survey instrument design, data collection and analysis, and presentation of results to the local police department. This study illustrates how experiential learning, specifically a CBR approach, can be integrated within a criminal justice curriculum. The following narrative describes the research process and an assessment of student learning.

Experiential Learning in Criminal Justice Courses

A common experiential learning option in criminal justice programs is service learning. Service learning pedagogy seeks to connect coursework with field experiences providing students an opportunity to learn content in the classroom and to make application of that knowledge in settings that address an unmet community need (Fertman, 1994). For example, students can take an abstract concept or theory and apply it to situations in the "real world." A critical component of this pedagogy is the written student reflection which provides the mechanism to synthesize the experience with the academic knowledge (Dewey, 1938). Generally, service learning requires students to spend a predetermined number of hours at a criminal justice or related social service organization where students reflect upon their experiences through writing and/or discussion. This mode of experiential learning can be integrated into a course or can be a stand-alone experience.

A review of the literature finds that service learning can be incorporated into criminal justice classrooms multiple ways, for example, as an alternative to a term paper (Lersch, 1997), participation in the Inside/Out program (Pompa, 2004), or qualitative field work in a graduate class (Morris & Marquart, 2010). Others have utilized service learning with their students and justice involved youths and juvenile justice professionals (Hirschinger-Blank & Markowitz, 2006) and field immersion in youth street outreach (Starks, Harrison & Denhardt, 2011). A wide range of experiences have been employed in the criminal justice classroom under the service learning model.

Community-based Undergraduate Research

Emphasis has been placed on providing opportunities for undergraduate research in order to develop future scholars. The benefits of involving students in research, according to the Council on Undergraduate Research, include enhanced learning through mentoring relationships, development of critical thinking, creativity, problem solving and intellectual independence, increased understanding of research methodology, and promotion of innovation-oriented culture (Council on Undergraduate Research, n.d.).

Paul (2003) defines community-based undergraduate research (CBUR) to include the following: (1) collaboration between the community, faculty, and students; (2) situation of the research in an educational context; and (3) provision of service to address unmet identified needs in the community. CBUR is further described as public scholarship—"rigorous research as a form of service to the public good" (Paul, 2006, p. 13). The project described below meets this definition. The collaborative effort is between the local police department, undergraduate students, and the faculty member in a criminal justice capstone course. Additionally, members of the community include the businesses and local agencies that complete the survey and provide input. The educational context is clearly evident as the work was completed as part of a course requirement. A need was identified by the community partner (police department); however, they did not have the resources to conduct the research. Typically, examples of CBR may include non-governmental community organizations (Cooke & Thorme, 2011; Paul, 2006; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003). There is slight twist on the project because it includes a governmental agency and is structured as a group, rather than an individual student project.

While CBR has been utilized in other disciplines for quite some time, it has not been widely used in criminal justice. CBR focuses on addressing needs identified by the community and bringing about positive change by improving the lives of those in the community (Strand, 2000). The following descriptions are provided to demonstrate how CBR has been implemented in different undergraduate disciplines.

In sociology, small-scale CBR has been utilized in a basic research methods course as an option to meet independent research requirements. Projects have involved a small group of students addressing a host of issues including a needs assessment of child care for low-income mothers, rates of participation of African-American women in breast cancer screening programs, a needs assessment for a Hispanic community, and an examination of programs and services available to previously incarcerated women to address their drug and alcohol problems (Strand, 2000). These projects included the use of interviews, focus groups, questionnaires, and multi-method approaches. In another example, CBR was utilized in a community development sociology course for the creation of a community-based development plan in a small rural community.

Working with the local economic development agency, the professor and his students were involved in creating a community-controlled plan for development. Students were involved in interviewing stakeholders in the community, collecting data, and gathering information on best practices (Weinberg, 2003). In political science, a CBR involved a program evaluation of an organization selling vehicles to low-income households at minimal cost (Willis, Peresie, Waldref, & Stockmann, 2003). Three students conducted surveys and follow-up interviews with staff and consumers to determine whether the program goals meshed with actual outcomes. Findings of this research were shared with similar organizations and resulted in the organization changing the way it delivers its program to participants. As illustrated, CBR, at its core embodies: collaboration with the community, democratization of knowledge, and positive community change (Strand et al., 2003). Finally, there has been an emphasis to provide a more holistic approach to CBR in higher education by encouraging the implementation of this type of pedagogy at the institutional level (Strand et al., 2003).

A review of the criminal justice pedagogical literature did not reveal any examples of CBR; however, a course-based experiential research project was found. Portillo, Rudes, Sloas, Hutzell, and Salamoun (2012) integrated a research opportunity into an undergraduate capstone course entitled Criminology, Law & Society. Students were required to write a research paper on drug courts using data they gathered and analyzed with qualitative methods. The course was writing intensive and the preparation of the required research paper was enhanced by devoting a weekly class period for students to utilize the research writing laboratory overseen by a graduate assistant. The role of "student as scholar" was emphasized; however, the linkage to the community was not included.

The current project provided students the opportunity to connect to the larger community and emphasizes the important role community plays in the administration of criminal justice practices, programs, and policies. In addition, it provides a framework for students to become active and civically engaged citizens in their own communities. The immediate benefit of this project for students is the hands-on, "real world" research experience which benefits the community. The longer term impact is that it provides students exposure to practitioner–researcher collaboration, albeit on a small scale.

The significance should not be taken lightly as surveys indicate that a majority of students enter undergraduate criminal justice programs with the goal of becoming police officers (Johnson & White, 2002; Kelley, 2004; Tontodonato, 2006); some have estimated this to be between 44 and 59% (Krimmel & Tartaro, 1999). However, once in the field, there are challenges to getting police practitioners to use research in decision-making (Rojek et al., 2012). Ultimately, the goals for the course were to plant the seed emphasizing (1) the importance of undertaking research in the field and (2) mutually beneficial collaborations.

Capstone in Criminal Justice

Prior to the beginning of spring semester 2014, a representative from the local police department and I discussed ideas for potential research collaborations for a capstone course. The result was a hands-on research endeavor where students would develop a method to answer questions posed by the police department. This involved the creation of a data collection instrument, the construction of a list of elements, and a host of other issues that were brought to life through this research experience. The class was offered Spring Semester 2014 and was capped at 15 students. Over the course of the semester, no one dropped the course which may be explained by the fact that the course is required to graduate. There was a mix of junior and senior students in the class.

Class Structure

The undergraduate capstone included two components: (1) an embedded experiential learning opportunity structured as a community-based group research project and (2) a seminar-based discussion intended for students to critically think and integrate previous criminal justice coursework and contemporary issues in criminal justice. Seminar topics included procedural justice, drug policy, wrongful convictions, community justice, and translational criminology. The research project took place over the entire semester, while the seminar portion started after midterms. This study focuses on the community-based project only.

   The class met at 8:00 am twice a week for 80 min. Each class was devoted to the discussion of readings and the planning of the research project. Periodically, students would use the second class period to actively work on the project including going into the field to collect data. On at least two occasions, the class met in the field to deliver the surveys. The content of each class was loosely structured so that we could talk about the readings and to address any issues arising from the research effort. The ability to communicate outside of class was critical in order to keep the project flowing. Students and the instructor utilized the university's online learning management system for announcements, discussions, posting of resources, and for any other needed communication.

CBR Project

As mentioned earlier, the police department identified the questions and the study area to be addressed. The students would need to translate these questions into a research plan and to develop the steps required to carry out the

work; they were active participants in designing, guiding, and producing the research.

The project, at its core, involved the department which was ready to launch a new patrol initiative to allocate dedicated personnel to the city's main commercial corridor. There were three overarching questions to be answered and the results from the class project were to be used as a benchmark for future efforts: (1) What are the issues and concerns that impact businesses[1]; (2) What are the times businesses perceive to be most important for patrol presence; and (3) How satisfied are the businesses with the police? The study area included the central business district and an adjacent historic neighborhood. In order to address these questions, there were many issues the class needed to think through. What was the best method to gather these data? Was there a list of businesses already compiled and if not, what needed to be done? What approvals were required for the research to be undertaken? These were just a few items students needed to consider.

Over the semester, students were required to work in groups and the composition of these groups changed by design depending on the required task. In addition to the group work, individual assignments were given. These included readings, reflections, and writings related to the topics covered for the research project.

The method required to gather the information from the potential respondents needed to be determined. After discussing the strengths and weaknesses of different survey methodologies, the class consensus was to use a self-administered survey to be hand delivered to all business owners and managers in the study areas. The decision to deliver the surveys in person was made based on a number of reasons, including the cost to mail the nearly 200 surveys and perhaps more importantly students thought that the face-to-face contact with local businesses may increase response rates (Trochim, 2006). The next step was to construct the survey and the list of business addresses. All students were required to gather and present the results of their search of the literature on police surveys of businesses to the class. These materials were also uploaded into the course learning management system for future reference. The class split into two teams: the first gathered examples of police-business surveys to develop a draft survey instrument (survey team) and the other team (map team) went into the field to compile a list of business names and addresses. The survey team created a draft based on the information collected and the presented it to the group for discussion and approval. This was a deliberative process and was particularly beneficial from my perspective because we went over each question and students became critically aware that every detail counts in terms of question and response wording. The draft survey was revised and the final instrument was accepted by all members of the

---

1. Businesses included all non-residential land uses along the corridor, for example: churches, non-profit agencies, medical offices, and social service agencies.

class. It was then reviewed by the police department, and they suggested some minor revisions.

Since there was not an existing list of businesses in the study area, students had to determine the best way to collect the data using a combination of field research and secondary data sources including the county real estate auditor's database and Google Street View. The "map" team divided themselves up to canvas the study areas to gather the business names and addresses to create the list. Once the list was created, it was field checked again by the team members. This list was used to create the labels for the survey packets to be delivered. In all, nearly 200 businesses were identified to receive the survey.

Before the survey could be distributed, students were required to complete the University's training for in-class group research projects. The survey instrument also needed approval from the University's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The University required training to be completed through the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative's online modules. Next, a representative from the University's Office for Advanced Research came to class to discuss ethics in research and the university's process for obtaining approval. As an individual assignment, each student was required to create an informed consent letter to accompany the survey. The final survey, after having the police department review it, was submitted to the IRB for approval.

An introductory protocol was established with a script of sorts which students would use to introduce themselves and the survey effort to business managers or owners; this was to ensure that a consistent message was provided to all survey recipients. Students also discussed the fact that they would be meeting community members face-to-face and that their appearances mattered. The group decided to dress in "business casual" attire when they delivered the packets. The survey packets were delivered prior to spring break. Student response indicated that they enjoyed being out in the field getting to know the community and talking to citizens. Students were also excited to see the returned envelopes I brought in each class period. We used an abbreviated version of Dillman's (2000) method by hand delivering the packets which contained a cover letter (containing both the police department and university logos signed by the police department representative and myself), survey, consent form, and a postage paid return envelope. After two weeks, a follow-up postcard was delivered thanking those who had responded and reminding those who had not that their participation was valued and encouraged them to return the survey at their earliest convenience. Contact information was provided for respondents to obtain another copy of the survey if they had misplaced the original.

The next phase of the project included entering the survey results and data analysis. Qualtrics, an online survey tool, was used to create a template for data entry. Students on the data entry, analysis, and cleaning team were provided a web link to enter data. This method allowed multiple students to enter data simultaneously and remotely. Analyses were conducted using SPSS and the results were provided to the class for discussion and to determine the next

steps. Teams were reconfigured and tasked with researching best practices used in other communities to address the most pressing issues identified by the survey and creating the final report and presentation. Product deliverables included a presentation and written report for the police department.

Based on the research presented to the police department, the following is an excerpt of the feedback I received:

> Having baseline data for our engagement and enforcement efforts allows us to use our scarce resources in the most efficient and effective manner. It also gives us the precise tools we need to plan for and revise our resource allocations in order to provide the greatest good for our residents. Please know that your research is having a direct impact on the safety and security of our community.

Overall, the project gave students experience not only in designing, guiding, and producing survey research, but it also engaged students with the community to address a need. Beyond addressing the three questions posed by the police department, the experience gave them a better understanding of how disorder can impact the perceptions of business districts. Additionally, other factors critical for student professional development (e.g., project management, collaboration, interpersonal, and critical thinking skills) were also addressed. Finally, the effort provided benefits to the community partner in meeting their goals of enhancing public safety and improving their community engagement efforts.

Assessment of Student Learning

Near the end of the semester, I informed students of my interest to use our experience to provide a teaching example for others. I developed a student survey to measure the mastery of course content, especially relating to survey methodologies and the research process. Questions also included students' perceptions about working with their peers, time management, and other skills needed for the semester long project. This student survey received IRB approval. Ideally, the student survey would have been given to students during the last week of class during our class period; however, due to time constraints, it was not ready to administer on the last day of class. An e-mail containing the survey link was sent to all class members using Qualtrics, a web-based survey program. The link allowed for anonymous completion of the survey. Nine students responded, resulting in a 60% response rate.

The student survey was divided into five sections. The first section addressed the change in students' perceptions of knowledge and understanding of the research process comparing the first class to the last class. All subsequent sections were post-test only with responses provided on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The second section included questions regarding research skills acquired over the semester;

recognition of the uncertainty and complexity inherent in the research process; whether the project provided an opportunity to be creative in designing solutions and processes; and their understanding of research ethics. The third section asked students about their perceptions of the research project, including whether they believed the project was a positive experience; the benefit of visiting the local historical society; interactions with business owners and the community; understanding the importance of collaborations between practitioner agencies and universities; increased understanding of research method topics; confidence in their ability to conduct research; recognition of the importance of the connection between the project and academic coursework; and finally, students' ability to effectively contribute to solving a "real world" problem/issue. The fourth section addresses attitudes and perceptions of the skills students utilized for the project to address a "real world" problem; development of time management skills; leadership qualities; understanding of collaborative work; interpersonal cooperation; critical thinking and problem solving skills; and the synthesis of knowledge. The final section provided an opportunity for students to add their own comments in an open-ended format.

Design: Post-then-pre- or Retrospective Post-then-pre-test

The post-then-pre-design (also known as the retrospective post-then-pre-design) was used to measure the extent of change in students' self-reported knowledge, awareness, skills, confidence and attitudes or behaviors (Klatt & Taylor-Powell, 2005) over the course of the semester. Generally, a pre-/post-test design would be used to measure the change in attitudes at the beginning and upon completion of the class. However, response shift bias is a potential threat to validity in traditional pre—post designs (Howard, 1980; Howard et al., 1979). This bias is a result of respondents overestimating or underestimating their abilities at the onset (pre-test) only to discover that they did not have had an adequate understanding of the concept being measured upon completing the program, training, or course. For example, if given a pre-test at the beginning of the capstone course which asked students to rate their level of understanding of and confidence in using research methodologies, students may over- or underestimate their abilities.

Both designs contain strengths and weaknesses (Colosi & Dunifon, 2006; Klatt & Taylor-Powell, 2005). Benefits of the post-then-pre-method include reduction of response shift bias, improvements in validity, versatility, and convenience allowing for the collection of responses for two time periods on one instrument. Limitations include issues associated with telescopic recall, self-reporting, and cognitive dissonance. Although the design is not regarded as a rigorous method to evaluate behavioral outcomes, it is considered appropriate if the goal of the evaluation is to measure perceived change due to program (or course) participation (Colosi & Dunifon, 2006).

Generally, a paired sample t-test would be used for analysis; however, due to the small sample size and the question about these data meeting the normality assumptions, the non-parametric sign test was used. While the null hypothesis for the t-test would have been that the average reported scores are the same for both the pre- and the post-test, the null for the sign test is that the difference between the two scores is zero. The sign test identifies the direction in the movement of scores, however, not the magnitude. Table 1 presents the results of the sign test.

In addition, the student survey included questions about perceptions of other competencies acquired over the course, these are post-test only and the descriptives are presented in Table 2.

Overall, students perceived a positive movement of scores for the concepts being measured. Results of the post-then pre-survey indicate that students scored higher on measures of student learning ($p < .05$) on questions about their knowledge to conduct survey research, understanding the importance of constructing proper survey responses, and understanding how different survey methods can impact response rates. They also showed agreement with increased learning in the other competencies measured as follows: research skills, community-based project skills, and professional skills. It appears that the anticipated increases in improvement in student learning were gained through this experiential learning opportunity.

Comments received on the end-of-semester teaching evaluation were overwhelmingly positive and included the following statements indicating that "field study was excellent." Students also stated that they "Enjoyed working in conjunction with the Police Department. This was a great way to understand research and how effective we can be in presenting strategies in reducing crime in the city." Another student stated "All of the hands-on activities were strengths in the course. We were actively in the field deploying a survey that we had developed. It was a great experience."

In summary, students demonstrated measurable increases in learning and the qualitative feedback was positive and indicated that the experience was a

Table 1 Sign test results

	Exact sig (2-tailed)
I have the knowledge to conduct survey research	.016*
I understand the importance of creating proper survey responses	.031*
I understand how different survey methods may impact response rates	.031*
I have confidence that I can conduct survey research	.016*
I understand the importance of the relationship between the police and the community it serves	.063

*$p < .05$ (2-tailed).

Table 2 Descriptive statistics

	N	Mean	SD
Research skills			
I have acquired research skills that will serve me well in my career.	9	4.44	.527
The research project showed that there is a certain amount of uncertainty and complexity in the research process.	9	4.44	.726
Exposure to this project provided me a better understanding that research is an iterative process (for example: even the best made research plan may need to be altered once in the field).	9	4.56	.527
This project allowed me to be creative in designing solutions and processes to add to final product.	9	4.44	.726
I have an understanding of the ethics in research.	9	4.56	.726
Community-based research project			
This community-based research project was a positive experience for me.	9	4.67	.500
The visit to the Butler County Historic Society increased my understanding of the history of the city of Hamilton.	9	4.56	.726
Being out in the field, on the city streets, interacting with businesses gave me a greater appreciation for the community.	9	4.67	.500
This class gave me a better understanding of how universities and practitioners can collaborate on research projects (even something as small a administering a survey).	9	4.67	.707
This hands-on experience solidified my understanding of research methods topics.	9	4.67	.500
Confidence in my ability to conduct research has increased as a result of the survey conducted in this class.	8	4.50	.756
This project provided a focus on the connection between previously acquired criminal justice knowledge, the community, and the specific problem at hand.	9	4.78	.441
I feel that I was able to effectively contribute to gathering data and was able to address a "real world" problem/issue.	9	4.78	.441
Professional skills			
The research project provided an opportunity to address a "real world" problem.	9	4.67	.500
The project allowed me to gain project management skills (time management, work flow).	9	4.56	.527
I was able to develop leadership qualities as part of this project.	9	4.67	.500
I gained a deeper understanding of the importance of individual roles in collaborative work.	9	4.56	.527
I was able to improve my interpersonal cooperation skills.	9	4.44	.527
Our class project provided the opportunity to use critical thinking skills.	9	4.56	.527
This project provided me the ability to problem solve.	9	4.56	.527
The research project provided the opportunity to synthesize knowledge acquired in other courses.	9	4.33	.500

Note. Scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

good one. These outcomes coupled with the broader goals of the project indicate that this pedagogical approach was well received and is an effective pedagogy to apply community-based research.

Lessons Learned

There were several valuable lessons I learned from teaching this class. I was amazed and impressed to see some students taking a leadership role in the research process. These were the same students whom I had previously taught who did not take an active role in traditional lecture-based courses. This was not a measured learning outcome, but it is an important competency for students to have as they enter their prospective careers. It was very refreshing to see students actively participate in all phases of the project and to see them when they had their "ah ha" moments. Their vested interest in the final product only seemed to increase their level of interest and engagement.

There were also some challenges which included my perception that some students were not comfortable in a class that was not highly structured. The research portion of the class was outlined in the syllabus, but had to be revised on several occasions due to inclement weather (the university was closed and our class canceled twice) and issues that arose during the fieldwork component. Students did not embrace technology as much as I thought they would. For example, they preferred to meet in person although it became problematic to do so outside of class due to their busy schedules. They were reluctant to use video conferencing. Also, I encouraged them to be creative in the production of the final report, even suggesting that it be put together as an eBook or other digital medium.

Some students also appeared to have some difficulty writing up data that were presented in tabular format. This is particularly relevant because soon these students will be practitioners and will need to interpret and create visual representations of data. Not only is it important to conduct research, it is equally important to present results in an easily interpretable and understandable manner for use by various audiences, including the public.

Not all students desire to continue their studies at the graduate or professional level; many will enter the criminal justice field as practitioners. The applied research skills gained in the capstone should serve them well and the project has also exposed them to the value of collaboration between practitioners and university partners. For example, the agency accreditation process for the Commission on the Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) requires measures of citizen satisfaction typically conducted through survey research. Those students who enter the law enforcement field should now have the basic competency (or at least familiarity) to design and carry out a survey to assess satisfaction for CALEA or other agency purposes.

There were multiple goals for the research component of the capstone course. These included incorporation of experiential learning in the classroom, providing the opportunity to involve students in applied research, and collaboration with the community (local police department and businesses) to address an unmet need. These goals were met. An enduring goal would be to instill in the minds of students the importance of research and collaboration especially as they rise among the ranks of their profession.

Faculty

Paul (2003) notes that faculty members who chose to serve the community may inadvertently be harming their chances of promotion and tenure by putting time and energy into efforts that may not lead to opportunities for publication. This may discourage many faculty members from implementing community-based opportunities in the classroom. Notwithstanding, there are benefits to faculty members and the university. Some challenges addressed in prior research should be considered before undertaking this type of project. These items include the upfront time it takes to develop and sustain relationships with community partners (Lersch, 1997), ensuring that students know the content, guiding the research process, and addressing any unforeseen problems along the way. Compared to a traditional lecture or seminar class, I invested a considerable amount of time outside the classroom (and outside the semester) for this class project to ensure that it met the stated goals and provided a presentable product to the police agency. Others have cautioned that integrating this type of service learning in a class is best for those programs that can provide graduate students or other means of faculty support (Portillo et al., 2012). Although I did not have additional support to conduct this class, I found the experience to be very rewarding personally and professionally and plan to use the CBR framework again.

It should be noted that there are limitations in this narrative which describes this example of CBR teaching pedagogy. Measures of student learning were limited by the small class size. In the future, while it may appear favorable to included responses from multiple courses to increase the sample size, it may be difficult to ensure validity across classes because the projects could be significantly different in method and scope.

This study was the product of an idea that germinated from my participation in a faculty learning community which focused on the scholarship of teaching and learning. At the onset, I had not planned to use this course as a case study, but as the learning community continued, it appeared to be a natural extension to share experiences and results of the CBR teaching approach. In all, both the students and I, found this course to be a positive learning experience and appreciated the opportunity to be involved in research which will contribute to positive changes in the community.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on Contributor

Theresa Ervin Conover is an assistant professor in the Department of Justice & Community Studies at Miami University. Her research interests focus on policing in communities including citizen satisfaction with the police and other local government services, and the role of citizen participation in the prevention of crime.

ORCID

Theresa Ervin Conover ![ORCID] http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3011-6501

References

Backes, B. (2009). NIJ seeks to strengthen the practitioner-researcher bond. *Corrections Today, 71*, 78—80.

Colosi, L., & Dunifon, R. (2006). *What's the difference? "Post then Pre" & "Pre then Post"*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Cooperative Extension.

Cooke, D., & Thorme T. (2011). *A practical handbook for supporting community-based research with undergraduate students*. Washington, DC: Council on Undergraduate Research.

Council on Undergraduate Research. (n.d.). *Fact sheet*. Washington, DC: Council on Undergraduate Research. Retrieved from http://www.cur.org/about_cur/fact_sheet/

Dewey, J. (1938). *Logic: The theory of inquiry.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Fertman, C. I. (1994). *Service learning for all students. Fastback 375*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Hirschinger-Blank, N., & Markowitz, M. W. (2006). An evaluation of a pilot service-learning course for criminal justice undergraduate students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 17*, 69—86.

Howard, G. S. (1980). Response-shift bias: A problem in evaluating interventions with pre/post self-reports. *Evaluation Review, 4*, 93—106.

Howard, G. S., Ralph, K. M., Gulanick, N. A., Maxwell, S. E., Nance, S. W., & Gerber, S. K. (1979). Internal invalidity in pretest-posttest self-report evaluations and a re-evaluation of retrospective pretests. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 3*, 1—23.

International Association of Chiefs of Police. (n.d.). *Establishing and sustaining law enforcement-researcher partnerships: Guide for researchers*. Arlington, VA: International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Johnson, K., & White, J. T. (2002). The use of multiple intelligences in criminal justice education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 13*, 369—386.

Kelley, T. M. (2004). Reviewing criminal justice baccalaureate curricula: The importance of student input. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 15*, 219—237.

Klatt, J., & Taylor-Powell, E. (2005). Program development and evaluation. Using the retrospective post-then-pre design, quick tips #27. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Krimmel, J. T., & Tartaro, C. (1999). Career choices and characteristics of criminal justice undergraduates. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 10,* 277–289.

Lersch, K. M. (1997). Integrating service learning in undergraduate criminal justice courses: Bringing academics to life. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 8,* 253–261.

Morris, R. G., & Marquart, J. W. (2010). In the classroom and on the streets: How to teach qualitative field research to criminology/criminal justice graduate students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 21,* 526–539.

Paul, E. L. (2003). Undergraduate research for the public good: Engaging undergraduates in community-based research. *Council on Undergraduate Research Quarterly, 23,* 180–185.

Paul, E. L. (2006). Community based research as scientific and civic pedagogy. *Peer Review, 8,* 12–15.

Pompa, L. (2004). Disturbing where we are comfortable: Notes from behind the walls. *Reflections: A Journal of Writing, Service Learning, and Community Literacy, 4,* 24–34.

Portillo, S., Rudes, D., Sloas, L., Hutzell, K., & Salamoun, P. (2012). Students as scholars: Integrating independent research into undergraduate education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education,* 1–29.

Rojek, J., Smith, H., & Alpert, G. (2012). The prevalence and characteristics of police practitioner-researcher partnerships. *Police Quarterly,* 241–261.

Starks, B. C., Harrison, L., & Denhardt, K. (2011). Outside the comfort zone of the classroom. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 22,* 203–225.

Strand, K. (2000). Community-based research as pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 7,* 85–96.

Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). *Community-based research and higher education: Principles and practices.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Tontodonato, P. (2006). Goals, expectations, and satisfaction of criminal justice majors: Implications for faculty, students, and programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 17,* 162–180.

Trochim, William M. K. (2006). *The research methods knowledge base* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Atomic Dog.

Weinberg, A. S. (2003). Negotiating community-based research: A case study of the "Life's Work" project. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9,* 26.

Willis, J., Peresie, J., Waldref, V., & Stockmann, D. (2003). The undergraduate perspective on community-based research. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9,* 36–43.